

# METHODIST REVIEW.

(BIMONTHLY.)

WILLIAM V. KELLEY, D.D., Editor.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. THE SPECULATIVE SIGNIFICANCE OF FREEDOM. <i>Professor B. P. Bourne, LL.D., Boston University, Boston, Mass.</i> . . . . .	681
II. HANS SACHS, THE POET OF THE REFORMATION. <i>President N. W. Clark, B.D., Italy Theological School, Rome, Italy.</i> . . . .	698
III. THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AS A WORKING BODY. <i>J. D. Walsh, D.D., Lexington, Ky.</i> . . . .	712
IV. SALVABILITY OF HERETICS. <i>Rev. C. C. Starbuck, Amherst, Mass.</i> . . . .	720
V. JOHN WOOLMAN AND STEPHEN GIRARD—A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE BIOGRAPHY. <i>Rev. G. M. Hammell, Cincinnati, O.</i> . . . .	741
VI. SOCIAL AND ETHICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF INDIVIDUAL WEALTH. <i>G. M. Steele, D.D., Auburndale, Mass.</i> . . . .	751
VII. METHODIST EPISCOPACY IN TRANSITION. <i>Bishop J. M. Thoburn, D.D., Calcutta, India.</i> . . . .	764
VIII. THE SONG OF SONGS—A STUDY OF ITS PLAN AND PURPORT. <i>Rev. W. W. Martin, M.A., Washington, D. C.</i> . . . .	775
EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:	
NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS . . . . .	787
Leaders and Prophets, 788; Human Society as it Was, Is, and Shall Be, 790; About Reading, 794.	
THE ARENA . . . . .	801
The Kingdom of God, 801; Who is Responsible for it? 803; The Humanity of Christ, 804.	
THE ITINERANTS' CLUB . . . . .	806
A Neglected Factor in Christian Evidence, 806; Development in Sermonic Composition (Continued), 807; Conference Examinations, 806.	
ARCHAEOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH . . . . .	811
David as a Psalmist, 811.	
MISSIONARY REVIEW . . . . .	815
Rights of Foreign Residence and Titles in China, 815; The Issue in Japan, 816; The Work of God in East Central Africa, 817.	
FOREIGN OUTLOOK . . . . .	819
SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES . . . . .	827
BOOK NOTICES . . . . .	831

NEW YORK:  
HUNT & EATON.  
CINCINNATI:  
CRANSTON & CURTS.

Subscription Price, Postage Included, \$2.50.

[Entered at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., as second-class mail matter.]



# If You

Remember

Only

One

Word



You Can Easily Find the Whole Text

IN THE

## EXHAUSTIVE CONCORDANCE OF THE BIBLE,

By JAMES STRONG, S.T.D., LL.D.

It is the only complete Concordance of the common English Bible, as a brief comparison with any other will immediately prove. Every previous Concordance, from Cruden to Young, omits many words and very many passages altogether; this exhibits every word, and every passage in which each occurs.

CONTAINING

1. **A Complete Concordance** of the King James Version of the English Bible. Every word of both the Old and New Testaments is cited, and every occurrence of each word in its order. This is not true of any English Concordance heretofore published.
2. **A Comparative Concordance,** noting all the variations from the King James Version in the New Revision; and also indicating the source of these variations—whether they were made by the English or by the American revisers, or accepted by both.
3. **A Hebrew-Chaldee and Greek Lexicon,** containing a complete vocabulary of these languages as used by the sacred writers, and, by an ingenious system of numerical references, enabling the English reader to find, pronounce, and get the force of the very word which the inspired writer used to convey his thought.

**LARGE QUARTO VOLUME. MORE THAN 1,800 PAGES. A GREAT BOOK AT REMARKABLY LOW PRICES.**

Transportation prepaid.

Fine Cloth, Red Edges,	- - -	Net.
Half Russia, Cloth Sides, Marbled Edges,	- - -	\$6
Half Turkey Morocco, Marbled Edges,	- - -	8
		10

A Descriptive Pamphlet furnished on request, free of charge.

**HUNT & EATON, Publishers, 150 Fifth Avenue, N. Y.**  
**CRANSTON & CURTS, Cincinnati, O.**







E,

a

En-  
the  
er.

the  
ew  
ere

m-  
of  
er-  
of

T





# METHODIST REVIEW.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1895.

---

## ART. I.—THE SPECULATIVE SIGNIFICANCE OF FREEDOM.

By freedom I mean the power of self-control and self-direction in an intelligent being. More specifically, it is the power to form plans, purposes, ideals and to work for their realization. Or it is the power to choose between competing or conflicting possibilities and to realize the one chosen. Wherever this power is present we call the agent free. To unsophisticated thought men are manifestly free in this sense. Their freedom is, indeed, not unlimited and lawless, for it exists only on the basis of fixity provided by human nature and the nature of things. But, within the limits set by our constitution and the physical environment, men have a power of self-direction. They are able to form plans, purposes, ideals and to devote themselves to their realization. Moreover, this power seems to be involved in the very thought of a personal and rational life. A life of the Punch and Judy type, in which there is a deal of lively chattering and the appearance of strenuous action, without, however, any real thought and effort, is not a personal or rational life at all. A life, also, in which consciousness is merely the stage on which underlying mechanical impulses masquerade is, likewise, no proper rational life. The person counts for nothing. He is not cause, but effect. He has no initiative, but is through and through resultant.

But, as I have said, this is not the impression which life makes upon the unsophisticated mind. It is only at a later stage, when reflection begins, that such a view becomes even intelligi-

ble. Meanwhile, life seems to be carried on by freedom or under the form of freedom. The underlying necessity, if there be any, at least mimics freedom, and that to such an extent that any description of personal life in terms of mechanical necessity would break down from sheer excess of absurdity. We see, then, in life, not merely a mechanical movement, but a personal and free movement. Within the bounds of law, free men are forming and realizing purposes and ideals, whether good or bad. It is this fact which makes history other than a branch of physics. Such is the appearance of life, and such our spontaneous faith.

But on the development of reflection this view is often discredited. The idea of law and of necessary causation is developed, and the doctrine of freedom becomes a speculative offense. Then it is shrewdly surmised that the belief in freedom is an illusion born of ignorance and thoughtlessness. Men do, indeed, imagine themselves free; but if we knew all we should find the reign of law as absolute in human action as in the movements of the planets. This surmise quickly passes into affirmation; and then it is given out that freedom is no longer admissible, even in idea, and, of course, not admissible in fact. Science or some other homemade divinity has pronounced against it, and nothing more is to be said. This sort of thing is sadly familiar to us all, and it has a certain plausibility with the critically illiterate. Have we any more certain intuition than the law of causation? Is not the reign of law a universal postulate of science, and does not every day confirm it? How, then, can we fail to see that the limiting result of mental progress must be to include all events, mental and physical alike, in one inviolable system of law and necessity?

The debate, as thus presented, is manifestly a speculative and transcendental one. It will be admitted by all that if we were really free we could hardly have a clearer sense of freedom than we actually possess. This, however, is set aside as illusory; for the difficulty in accepting freedom lies, it is said, in the very nature of reason itself. The argument, then, must be somewhat apagogical; that is, it must consist, not so much in direct appeal to consciousness, as in showing that freedom is involved in facts which all admit. The customary argument for freedom consists in appealing to the sense of responsibility

and in pointing out that freedom is a manifest implication of this and other facts of our moral nature. I pass this argument, however, with mere mention, and seek to show that freedom is as much an implication of the rational life as it is of the moral life. Hence the title of this paper—"The Speculative Significance of Freedom."

There is a very general conviction in speculative circles that the notion of freedom is an offense to reason. If we hold it at all it must be out of deference to moral interests and at a very considerable sacrifice of our intellectual peace. I believe, on the contrary, that freedom is involved in reason itself, and that the denial of freedom must lead to the collapse of reason. In giving the grounds of this belief I consider first the problem of error. That problem lies in this fact: First, it is plain that, unless our faculties are essentially truthful, there is an end to all trustworthy thinking. But, secondly, it is equally plain that a large part of thought and belief is erroneous. Hence the question arises, as a matter of life or death for rational thought, how to reconcile the existence of error with faith in the essential truthfulness of our faculties. Freedom, we shall see, is the only solution which does not wreck reason itself.

We may get an introduction to the problem, and also a good illustration of the ease with which men overlook the bearings of necessitarianism, by considering a passage from Mr. Herbert Spencer's *First Principles*. In the last paragraphs of Part I of that work he raises the question why an advanced and progressive thinker should oppose traditional beliefs after he has outgrown them, seeing that those beliefs may well be better adapted to those who hold them than his own broader views. To this Mr. Spencer gives this answer:

He must remember that, while he is a descendant of the past, he is a parent of the future, and that his thoughts are as children born to him, which he may not carelessly let die. He, like every other man, may properly consider himself as one of the myriad agencies through whom works the Unknown Cause; and when the Unknown Cause produces in him a certain belief he is thereby authorized to profess and act out that belief.

There is something attractive and inspiring in this utterance as long as we gaze upon the well-behaved and enlightened apostle of advanced thought who thus nobly represents the future and the Unknown Cause. But when we remember that Mr.

Spencer expressly includes all other men and all other beliefs in the same relation, and gives to them all the same sanction and authorization of the Unknown Cause, forthwith we begin to grope. For it is not the advanced thinker only who stands in this august relation and has this supreme sanction, but "every other man," also, "may properly consider himself as one of the myriad agencies through whom works the Unknown Cause;" and when the Unknown Cause produces in every other man a certain belief he, too, is "thereby authorized to profess and act out that belief." But it is plain that "every other man" is a somewhat numerous person, and his beliefs and acts, produced and authorized by the Unknown Cause, are a somewhat heterogeneous collection, which includes all the superstitions, absurdities, and abominations which have ever been evolved and all the horrors and cruelties which have ever been perpetrated. All of these are the product of the Unknown Cause, and the believers are, of course, "authorized to profess and act out" their beliefs; for all these are as "children born to them, which they may not carelessly let die."

The passage quoted from Mr. Spencer is rhetorically fine; but fine writing seems to be about all there is in it. It certainly is difficult to make out what the truth is in such a scheme. The Unknown Cause seems to have, not one opinion, but many; and it does not abide in any one for long. Particularly for a Spencerian it must be a very grave circumstance that the Unknown Cause has produced a great many false opinions for one true one; that, along with a little truth, it has shown an almost overwhelming tendency to error. It has shown a grotesque tendency to revel in low and unworthy views, fetichisms, anthropomorphisms, theologies, whims, infatuations, obstinacies, instead of attaining to the sun-clear truths of the synthetic philosophy. This is so much the case that latterly many persons of a pessimistic turn, of course at the instigation and with the sanction of the Unknown Cause, have begun to think meanly of the Unknown Cause and all its works, and especially of the account given of itself in the synthetic philosophy. In any case, it is plain that up to date the Unknown Cause has not advanced beyond an indefinite, incoherent heterogeneity of opinions, any one of which has the same source and sanction as any other. This is pretty tedious; and we have dwelt upon it at such length



only because it illustrates somewhat strikingly the position in which every system of necessity finds itself in dealing with the problem of error. For in such a system every thought, belief, conviction, whether truth or superstition, arises with equal necessity with every other. The belief in freedom is as necessary as the belief in necessity. Theism and atheism, spiritualism and materialism, freedom and necessity, consistency and caprice are alike necessarily produced in thought. Thoughts and beliefs become effects; and to speak of true and false thoughts seems like speaking of true or false chemical action or true or false blood. On this plane of necessary effect the actual is all, and the ideal distinctions of true and false have as little meaning as they would have on the plane of mechanical forces.

But possibly we may think to escape by a definition, and say that true thoughts are those that correspond to reality and false ones are those that do not thus correspond. But even if this be formally correct we are still no better off. For if, of these multitudinous thoughts which are necessarily produced, some are true and some are false we need to have some standard for distinguishing them from one another. But in what shall this standard consist? It is not in the necessity of the true thoughts and the nonnecessity of the false ones, for all are alike necessary. The belief in necessity is no more necessary than the belief in freedom. It would not help matters any to declare that true thoughts are the product of normal thinking, for the same puzzle would arise in finding a standard of normality. Just as little would it avail to take a vote on the subject; for there seems to be no logical connection between the notion of a majority and the notion of truth. The necessitarian, moreover, would be in a specially sorry plight, as the necessity which produces beliefs has produced the belief in freedom much more profusely than the belief in necessity. Besides, if there be a standard, how are we to use it? The thought of a standard implies a power to control our thoughts, to compare them with the standard, to reserve our decision, to think twice, to go over the ground again and again, until the transparent order of reason has been reached. But on this theory there is no such power. Thoughts come and thoughts go. Some are displaced by others, not because of any superior rationality, but because the new conditions have produced new conceptions. When, in a chemical

molecule, one element displaces another the new combination is not truer, but stronger, than the old. So, when a mental grouping is broken up and displaced by another it is not a question of truth, but of power. There is, then, not only no standard of truth, but no power to use it if we had it. Thus all beliefs sink into effects; and one is as good as another as long as it lasts.

These considerations make it clear that the question of freedom enters intimately into the structure of reason itself. It is a question, not merely of our executive activities in the outer world, but also of our inner rational activity. Hence the advantage of changing the venue from the court of ethics to that of reason. In the former there is always room for speaking of the weight of motives, of the stronger impulse, etc.; and thus we fail to get the clear illustration of freedom involved in the passionless operations of thought itself. There is the further advantage that everyone practically allows this self-control in thought. We are able to think twice, to return upon the argument, to tear asunder the plausible and misleading conjunctions of habit and association, and to reserve our decision until the crystalline connection of reason has been reached. The necessitarian is impatient of bad logic in his opponent, calls upon him to clear up his thoughts, and wonders why he is so slow in drawing a manifest conclusion. Even the materialist, for whom thinking is but the mental shadow of certain nervous processes, expects logic, and to that extent attributes freedom. For there is no hesitation, no thinking twice, no reserving of judgment in an order of necessary movement. There might possibly be a mimicry of such hesitation; but the reality could not exist in an order of necessity. In such an order the resultant is at once and irrevocably declared, as in the movement of a pair of scales. If we should make the grotesque supposition of a series of mechanical forces endowed with consciousness, what possible meaning could we attach to their demands upon one another for logic, or to their mutual reproaches for failure to think clearly or for holding this, that, or the other view? We should have necessity mimicking a free rational life; but the farcical nature of the performance would be apparent to the dullest.

Hence, in the field of thought proper, everyone, in spite of himself, assumes that reason is a self-controlling force. Freedom of thought cannot be rationally disputed without assuming

it. That advanced thinker whom Mr. Spencer introduced as in a strait whether to repress or express the truth that was in him made all the motions of freedom in Mr. Spencer's hands. Imagine a mind under the law of necessity puzzling itself with such a question. As well might we imagine a scale pan debating whether to rise or fall, and finally deciding to follow the heavier weight. And then reflect on the logical character of a debate in which the point denied has to be assumed to save the discussion from becoming farcical. Such is seen to be the real standing of the necessitarian argument as soon as we transfer the discussion to the field of thought. If, then, we were looking for the most important field of freedom we should certainly find it in the moral realm; but if we were seeking the purest illustration of freedom we should find it in the operations of pure thought. Here we have a self-directing activity, which proceeds according to laws inherent in itself and to ideals generated by itself.

But here it is important to note just what this freedom is. It is not a power to make things true or false at will. The rational connection of ideas and the uniformities of external nature we can neither make nor unmake. If we have the premises we cannot change the conclusion. Now, it is clear that freedom, which I defined as the power of self-direction in an intelligent being, is not to be taken to mean absolute and lawless arbitrariness. Such a conception would swamp reason no less than necessity does. Freedom, except on a basis of uniformity and fixity, is valueless and fatal to rationality. And this leads to a discovery. Freedom and uniformity must be united in rationality, and neither can dispense with the other. In our rational life we find the basis of uniformity given in the laws of thought and the fixed connections of ideas. We did not make the laws, and we cannot abrogate them. They are forever secure from all tampering and overthrow. Yet, though thus imperative, we find that they do not of themselves secure obedience. If they did error would be impossible. Hence, in addition to the laws of thought founded in the nature of rationality, there is needed an act of ratification and of self-control in accordance with those laws. Only thus does reason become regnant in our thinking; and only thus do we become properly rational beings. Again, the truths of reason and of physical science are quite independ-

ent of our volition. Yet the inviolability of their existence does not provide for our knowledge of them. They do not get themselves known, but we come to know them only through slow, painful, and persistent research. Science itself is one of the great achievements of human freedom. We do not drift into it, neither is it let down ready-made from the skies; but by the ceaseless toil and devotion of free men the temple of science and knowledge is slowly built up.

Here, then, in freedom is the source of both truth and error in knowledge. Our faculties are made for truth; but this alone does not secure truth. We must use those faculties carefully, critically, persistently if any valuable knowledge is to be reached. The chief factor in the progress of knowledge is the will and set purpose to know. Our faculties are made for truth, but they may be carelessly used or willfully misused; and thus error, with all its brood, is born. Here is the source of the whims, the caprices, the infatuations, the obstinacies of men. There is no solution of the problem of human error except in the fact of human freedom, at least none which does not overthrow reason itself. A rational activity must be a free activity—not a lawless or capricious one, indeed, but one which directs and controls itself from within according to its own inner light and law. When this is not the case reason sinks into a mental mechanism, for which the ideal distinctions of truth and error have neither meaning nor application. In that case error is not a human, but a cosmic, fact. It is not a result of human carelessness or willfulness, but a necessary product of persistent force or the fundamental reality or the Unknown Cause or whatever we choose to call the basal existence of the universe. Then we have to admit in the cosmos, not merely an element of reason, but a strong element of unreason—an element which has worked itself out into all the blunders and caprices and infatuations of men—an element, moreover, which up to date seems to be much too strong for the element of reason. The puzzles in which this view would land us have been indicated in treating of Mr. Spencer's Unknown Cause, which produces and authorizes everyone's beliefs.

The traditional arguments for both freedom and necessity have generally been shortsighted and superficial. They have commonly confined themselves to our executive activities in the

outer world, and have overlooked the significance of freedom in the thought-life. This has been largely due to supposing that the psychological distinctions of will and intelligence represent a real distinction of things, instead of different aspects of one thing. In this way will has been set apart for unintelligent and unmotivated willing, while the intellect is supposed to be complete in itself. With such a psychology it is not strange that nonsense has reigned supreme. In fact, however, both will and intellect are only a pair of abstractions. The reality is the willing, knowing self. The willing is not done in the dark of ignorance, but in the light of intelligence; and the knowing is not something that does itself, but something which is reached only through that will to know which lies at the root of knowledge. I am persuaded, therefore, that one wishing to find his way into this problem of freedom will do well to consider, first of all, the question of freedom in intelligence itself and the collapse of rationality involved in the system of necessity.

Thus far we have considered the significance of freedom in relation to the human subject. I next point out that, without assuming a free cause as the source of the outer, world the mind is unable to satisfy its own rational nature or to bring any line of thought to an end. Thus the search for unity and the desire for explanation and for the unification of the system of things in a common source are alike frustrated, until we pass beyond the order of necessary and mechanical thinking and rise to the conception of free intelligence as the source and spring of all existence. As we need the conception of freedom in man for the solution of the problem of error, so we also need the conception of freedom at the foundation of the cosmos to make it amenable to the demands of our intelligence. I argue as follows:

Only phenomena are given in immediate perception. Their causes are not given, and the nature of those causes is a problem to be solved by thought, not by sense. But the explanation of effects by necessary causes finally consists in assuming a cause or set of causes of such nature or in such relations that they must produce just those effects and no others. We carry the effects in principle into the causes, and our deduction of the effects consists in drawing out what we put in. We infer the causes from the effects, and deduce the effects from the causes.

But in all this we are simply manipulating an identical equation, reading it alternately from left to right and from right to left, with no real progress in either case. The gist of the method is thus given by Mephistopheles in "Faust :"

The first was so, the second was so,  
And hence the third and fourth were so;  
And had first and second never been,  
The third and fourth, too, had not been.

We know that the first and second were so because the third and fourth were so; and we know that the third and fourth must have been because we know by hypothesis that the first and second must have been.

In a necessary system, then, there is no real explanation. We merely read the present back into past conditions which implied the present; and our deduction of the present consists in reading those hypothetical past conditions forward into their assumed implications. Our thought merely oscillates between the present actual and the past potential, without reaching any simplicity as we go backward or making any advance as we come forward. The fact, however, is easily overlooked, for two reasons. One is that the aim in much of our explanation is purely practical and does not seek for any ultimate reason. Hence, when we have connected an event with other events according to some rule we count it explained; and practically there is no need to look further. If, then, our aim be practical, and not speculative, we may content ourselves with looking for the laws according to which events happen. But such explanation gives no real explanation; it only postpones the problem.

The other reason for our failure to see the vanity of all explanation by necessary causes is the ease with which simplifications of words are mistaken for simplifications of things. The complexity and plurality of things disappear in the simplicity and identity of the class term; and then we fancy that the things themselves have been simplified and unified. To complete the illusion, we assume that the class term implies all to which it applies, and, hence, the corresponding reality implies all the realities to which the class term applies. But in all this we are the prey of a logical, or rather a verbal, illusion. When we class things together we do nothing to the



things. We merely get a common name, which leaves the things as distinct as ever. And this name, though it applies to all the individuals, implies none of them. But untrained thought mistakes the order of logical manipulation for an order of reality; and thus some term, like "matter" or "force," which is really only the last term of logical abstraction, is made the first term of real existence; and thus, again, the logical subordination of individuals to the containing class is mistaken for an ontological implication. Of course, a mind under the influence of this illusion has no difficulty in reaching an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity at the beginning and in persuading it to evolve to order.

But when we guard against the illusive simplifications of verbal thinking it is evident that, on the plane of necessity, the desire for explanation can never be satisfied. As we go backward we carry the problem with us; and when, in weariness, we stop the problem in all its complexity is still with us. In a necessary system the antecedents which are to explain anything must already imply that thing to its minutest details. If they do not imply it they cannot produce it; and if they do imply it our thought moves in a circle. The net result is that things are as they are, and no more can be said about the matter. A positivist, of course, would profess himself satisfied with this result; but the human mind in general is not satisfied. Human thinking has been notoriously prolific of explanations and philosophies of things—a fact which shows the tendency and need of our reason. Unfortunately, this speculation has largely been carried on in ignorance of its own conditions and implications. Hence the numberless futile explanations which cumber the history of thought. But if we are to escape the deadlock to which the notion of necessity brings us it can be only by the conception of free intelligence. This is, indeed, the only real explanation of anything. Until we reach this we merely lose ourselves in the mazes of mechanism and wander through exceedingly dry places, seeking rest, but finding none.

A similar argument applies to the search for unity. We talk much of unity nowadays, and, indeed, monism is quite the order of the day. The conception of a fundamental pluralism is cast out as altogether abominable. This fact shows the strong speculative demand for unity, but it by no means shows

how and where unity may be found. The unities which experience presents us are mainly of a formal kind, as when we call a crowd one. In such cases the mind gives the form of unity to something which in itself is no unity at all. Such unities have no existence apart from the mind which forms them. But the speculative problem is to find a concrete unity, and not merely a formal one—a unity which has real, as well as conceptional, existence. And after much beating about it appears that such unity can never be found on the plane of necessity. From the plurality of cosmic manifestation we could never infer a necessary unity; nor could such unity ever produce a plurality. If we start with a plurality we never get behind it; and if we start with a unity it refuses to move at all. If we decide to call something a unity, so long as we view it as necessitated we are compelled to carry some kind of mechanism of metaphysical states into our alleged unity in order to secure any motion; and then, though we continue to speak confidently about unity, we are at a loss to tell in what it consists. The opposed and interacting states are as far as we get, and the unity is only in name. Reason, indeed, calls loudly for unity, but it has no means of integrating a plurality into a true unity or of differentiating a unitary necessity into a plurality. Here is another deadlock for the speculative reason, and the only way out of it lies in the notion of free intelligence. This is the one thing that can be manifold without being many, that can posit plurality over against itself and maintain its own unity, and that can bind the many together in the unity of plan and purposeful activity. Apart from this the world falls asunder into an unmanageable plurality, having only the formal unity our thought attributes to it, and being essentially a contradictory puzzle for our intelligence. Hence, the mind must either lose itself in an endless and bootless regress; or it must rise above the plane of necessity to a free mind, on which the cosmos depends and by which it exists.

Thus far we have explained and illustrated the fact of freedom and its significance for life, for science, for philosophy, for reason itself. This significance will further appear if we next examine the opposite idea of necessity. This is commonly supposed to be clear and self-evident, while freedom is the difficult notion. This illusion is pretty sure to arise during the early

stages of reflection ; but deeper reflection dispels it. The only clear conception we have of necessity is rational necessity—that is, the necessity which attaches to the relations of ideas, as in logic and mathematics. But this necessity is not found in experience, whether of the inner or outer world. The elements of experience and their connections are all contingent, so far as rational necessity goes ; that is, we cannot deduce them from ideas or connect them by any rational bond. The necessity, then, if there be any, is metaphysical. But this is an exceedingly obscure notion, and one which eludes any positive conception. It can be neither rationally comprehended nor sensuously cognized ; and the more we wrestle with the idea the worse our puzzle becomes. Consider the following difficulties :

Under certain conditions an event occurs, and we call it a necessary one. Now, the fact of observation, of course, is only that under certain conditions we have found that kind of event to happen. That it happens by necessity is something added to the observation. Uniformity of happening is all we find ; and, so far as observation goes, it is perfectly open to us to view this uniformity as administered by freedom. The freedom and the necessity are no part of the observation, but theories offered for its explanation. If, now, we say that the event was necessary, that its antecedents compelled it, we must certainly suppose that there was something in the antecedents which provided for it. How shall we think of that something ? The event itself was not actual until its occurrence. What was it before ? If we say the event simply followed the antecedents, without being determined by them, we give up all connection—even reason itself. The event, then, was in some sense predetermined and preexistent in its antecedents ; but how ? Here we help ourselves by a word and say, “ It was potential in them.” But “ potentiality ” is an obscure word, except on the plane of freedom. Here it refers to the possible self-determinations of the free spirit ; but what a necessary metaphysical potentiality might be is hard to say. It must be in some sense an actuality, or it could never modify actuality ; and yet it cannot be an actual actuality without antedating itself. We are driven, then, to distinguish two kinds of actuality—potential actuality and actual actuality—without, however, the least shadow of insight into

the distinction between them. Thus the doctrine of necessity finds itself in unstable equilibrium between the groundless becoming of Hume's doctrine, in which events succeed one another without any inner ground or connection, and a doctrine of freedom, in which the ground of progress and connection is to be found, not in an unmanageable metaphysical bond which defies all understanding, but in the ever-present freedom which posits events in a certain order, and thus forever administers all that we mean by the system of law and founds all that we mean by necessity in things.

The metaphysics of necessity is certainly very obscure, and it is even hard to keep the notion from vanishing under our hands. Mr. Mill felt so strongly both the difficulty of the notion and the lack of proof of any corresponding fact that he proposed to banish the term entirely from philosophy and replace it by the empirical notion of uniformity. But this may be only the obscurity which attaches to all ultimate facts; and the metaphysics of freedom may be equally or more obnoxious to criticism. This, indeed, is very generally alleged to be the case. The leading difficulties lie in the supposed demands of the principle of causality and in the alleged postulates of science. We must, in closing, devote a word or two to this matter.

The objections drawn from the law of causation rest upon a misunderstanding of both freedom and causation. Freedom is ascribed to the will, and the will is abstracted from feeling and intelligence. Thus freedom is reduced to blind arbitrariness and loses its value. But this fiction results, as we have seen, from mistaking the abstractions of psychology for separate and mutually indifferent factors. Fortunately, psychology has got beyond this. If anything is free it is not the will, but the knowing and feeling soul; and this soul determines itself, not in the dark of ignorance or in the indifference of emotionless and valueless life, but in the light of knowledge and with experience of life's values. Now, such self-directing activity does not violate the law of causation. That law tells us only to seek an agent; but it does not tell us what the agent must be. So far as the law goes, a self-directing cause is as possible as any other; indeed, it is the only cause of which we have any experience. Of course, we cannot tell how freedom is made or how freedom is possible; but just as little can we tell how necessity

is made or is possible. But, though we cannot tell how freedom is possible, we seem to have some experience of it as a fact, while we not only have no experience of metaphysical necessity, but the idea itself is elusive to the last degree, if, indeed, it does not disappear altogether, either in a groundless becoming, on the one hand, or in the infinite regress, on the other. Hence, so far as the law of causation is concerned, the question of free causality is simply one of fact. If experience shows, or seems to show, causes which have any measure of self-control and self-direction there is no good speculative or other reason against their recognition.

But now the objections drawn from the postulates of science are ordered up. Science assumes the uniformity of law, and thus excludes freedom. Science assumes that under like circumstances there must be the same result. Freedom assumes that under like circumstances there may be a different result. The opposition is absolute and forbids mediation. Either, says Mr. Spencer in his *Principles of Psychology*, mental phenomena are subject to law or they are not. If they are not subject to law his work and every other on the subject are nonsense. This is peremptory; and thus we seem to be landed in a very grievous antinomy. On the one hand, a system of necessity destroys reason, and, on the other hand, the admission of freedom is fatal to science. But it is plain that the supreme condition of science is reason itself. It is reason which generates science, and it is reason in whose interests science is wrought out. A conception of science, therefore, which implies the undermining of that very reason which produces science is manifestly self-destructive. We must, therefore, assume the free reason as the absolute condition of science, and determine the aims of science in accordance therewith.

Now, the objection to freedom in the interest of science is mainly a closet difficulty. It may be formidable in closet speculation and academic theorizing, but it has no real weight. It is, indeed, irrelevant to the true conception of both freedom and science. It tacitly assumes that freedom means pure lawlessness, whereas freedom itself presupposes the order of law as its condition. Freedom uses this order, and science studies this order. Science concerns itself with the modes of being and happening among things and events, and their existence and nature

are in no way affected by the question of freedom. The forms and laws of sensibility, the laws and categories of intelligence are not involved in freedom; and, whether we affirm or deny freedom, these laws and forms exist as the proper subject of psychological study. The belief in freedom vacates the science of psychology just as much and just as little as it vacates the science of physics or chemistry. In both mental and physical realms the believer in freedom finds an agent acting in accordance with an order of law and, by means of that order, freely realizing his own aims. Freedom, then, is not opposed to physics or chemistry or psychology or any other modest science which studies the laws of things and events, but only to "science"—that is, that speculative dream which aims to bind up all things in a scheme of necessity; and this, so far from being science, is simply one of those uncritical dreams of which the dogmatic intellect has ever been so prolific.

There is implicit, however, in this uncritical dream a speculative aim which deserves consideration. It results from the desire for totality or systematic completeness. There is an unwillingness to leave anything unrelated and uncomprehended. Hence, the ever-recurring fancy that, if we knew all, we should find everything bound up in a rigid and all-comprehending system. But this aim, which is a legitimate one, is thwarted by a profound ignorance of the conditions of its own attainment. Hence, the thought to find the systematic totality in a metaphysical necessity of the mechanical type. The impossibility of this we have already seen. Even supposing that metaphysical necessity means anything, we cannot attain to any finality by this road. We lose ourselves in an infinite regress and a boundless plurality. We have, also, so little insight into the contents of this necessity that we cannot tell what any moment may bring forth. There is no metaphysical security for any law of nature whatever. It may be necessary now, but how long it will stay so or what will be necessary to-morrow is quite beyond us. Thus we are left hopelessly in the lurch by the necessity to which we appeal.

But, in our revolt against necessity, we must be on our guard against falling into the opposite abyss of lawless caprice. A world in which events fall out by chance and haphazard is also intolerable to intelligence. And the fancy that this is the



alternative to necessity has been one great support of the latter doctrine. As long as this fancy is held, the mind must oscillate between the two extremes, being driven out from either as soon as it grasps its implications. The only way out lies in the notion of rational purpose, or of a Creator who is working a rational work in accordance with a rational plan. In this plan everything will have its place and function and will be comprehended in an all-embracing purpose. In this work we shall have no unintelligible metaphysical necessities called laws, but rather uniformities of procedure, freely chosen with reference to the plan. At the same time we shall have no lawless and chance events, as all will arise in accordance with the purpose of the whole. Metaphysical necessity in the world must be replaced in our thought by the conception of uniformity, administered by freedom for the attainment of rational ends. Here in the unity of the free Creator, in the unity of his plan, and in his ever-working will is the only place where the world has unity, completeness, and systematic connection. Metaphysics adds its conviction that here is the only place where the world has any existence whatsoever.

In this paper my aim has been to suggest fruitful lines of thought, rather than to carry out any one in detail. It is plain that the problems of thought and knowledge are more complex and subtle than the offhand and amateur speculator imagines. Current thought is full of verbal thinking mistaken for real thinking, of verbal simplifications and deductions mistaken for real simplifications and deductions, of abstract and partial views mistaken for concrete and complete views. The only remedy is to deepen and broaden our thinking, by surveying the problems of thought and life in their totality and in systematic connection. When this is done it will appear that freedom, instead of being an offense to reason, is one of the chief factors of the rational life.

*Borden P. Bourne.*

ART. II—HANS SACHS, THE POET OF THE REFORMATION.

ON the fifth of November, 1894, the Protestants of Germany celebrated the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of Hans Sachs. This humble shoemaker of Nuremberg became the most voluminous and the most popular German poet of the sixteenth century. Sachs occupies a unique place in the literature of the Fatherland; and a study of his life and times throws a sidelight upon the Reformation age which reveals many unnoticed, but most graphic and realistic, details. Hans Sachs was preeminently a child of his own times. To understand him properly and to appreciate him adequately it is necessary to study him historically. He shines most clearly and most attractively in his mediæval setting. One needs to stand in the dawning light of that wonderful sixteenth century; to walk through the quaint old streets of his native Nuremberg; to catch the sound of the awakening genius of the people; to count their heart throbs by the beating of their hammers; to feel the uplifting power of their new lore of learning and of their new hope of a fuller and freer spiritual life. Then he may look in at the doorway on the Kotgasse, see Hans Sachs busy every day at his shoemaker's bench, and be better able to comprehend how it was possible for this man to stir so mightily the moral consciousness of his countrymen and create for himself a permanent place in the history and literature of his age.

At the close of the fifteenth century, when Hans Sachs was born, Nuremberg had reached the highest point in its development. It had attained an almost unequalled commercial importance among the cities of Germany. During the Middle Ages the natural highway between southern and northern Europe was through the Brenner Pass, from Venice to Innspruck. As the stream of commerce flowed from Italy into Germany it emptied itself into the imperial cities of Augsburg and Nuremberg, and these became the chief markets for the products of the South and East. Nuremberg, however, was more favorably situated for trade with the North, and it also had an advantage over Augsburg in the great variety of its own manu-

factured articles. Its art industries were famous in all lands. Rarely does one find a more striking example of the influence of commerce upon industry and of industry upon art than in this mediæval city. The gold and silver, the pearls and precious stones, the ivory and costly woods which were brought from distant lands were a perpetual stimulus to the workers in these precious metals and materials.\* Most renowned of all the mediæval artists of Nuremberg was Albert Dürer. The same year that Hans Sachs was born the young painter, then twenty-three years of age, returned from a four years' journey through the chief cities of Germany.

A city which had attained such prosperity in commerce and in art was naturally coveted by the powers of the Church. It was considered especially desirable as a center for the various monastic orders. There were cloisters belonging to the Augustinians, the Dominicans, the Carmelites, and the Carthusians. Notwithstanding the presence of these active emissaries of the Church, the people in general were never largely influenced by the clergy. There was a sturdy independence and a self-aggressiveness about the citizens of Nuremberg which made it difficult for the priesthood to subdue and control them. It is true that the indulgence sellers often carried on a flourishing business in the city, but the reason was to be found, not so much in the people's faith in the efficacy of the indulgences, as in their loyalty to the emperor. The pope was preaching against the Turks, and he and his hirelings must be encouraged in their tirades against the common foe. The ninety-five theses nailed upon the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg resounded through the land like so many thunder peals. Nor did their echoes die away. All Germany was aroused. The eyes of the intelligent began to be opened to the hollowness of clerical pretense. Men of position and influence sympathized with the new movement. Pamphlet after pamphlet followed each other in quick succession. But these discussions were almost entirely confined to the monks, the nobility, and the ruling classes. The real nature of the controversy was not yet clearly comprehended by the common peo-

\*A manuscript catalogue, dating from the end of the sixteenth century and now preserved in the Royal Library at Berlin, enumerates more than two hundred distinct trades that were recognized in the city and district of Nuremberg.

ple. A voice was needed to speak to them in their own tongue and to arouse them to enthusiasm for the cause of the Reformation. That voice came from the shop of the Nuremberg shoemaker, in his first great poem—the song of the “Wittenberg Nightingale.”

Hans Sachs was an only child. His father, a respectable tailor, owned the house in which he lived and in which Hans was born. It stood on the Kotgasse, now called the Brunnen-gasse—a street leading to a large square whose center has been occupied, for nearly six hundred years, by the handsome Church of St. Lawrence. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the city possessed four Latin schools. The instruction was given by the clergy; but the schools stood directly under the supervision of a committee of the city council, of which Willibald Pirkheimer, a prominent advocate of humanism, was chairman. It was to one of these Latin schools that Hans Sachs was sent when he was seven years old. Here, in addition to the fundamental branches, the boy studied grammar, geography, and singing, as well as astronomy and Latin. He remained in school eight years, and showed early a craving for knowledge and a clear comprehension of what he learned. The elder Sachs considered it essential that his son should learn a trade. Consequently, at fifteen years of age, the boy was apprenticed to a shoemaker. During his two years of service he made the acquaintance of Lienhard Nunnenbeck, a linen weaver and, at the same time, a *meistersinger* of considerable repute. From this man young Hans learned the first principles of mastersinging, of which he afterward became the most notable representative. But he was not long able to prosecute these studies, because the time for his *Wanderjahre* had come. Says Thomas Carlyle:\*

*Wanderjahre* denotes the period which a German artisan is, by law or usage, obliged to pass in traveling to perfect himself in his craft, after the conclusion of his *Lehrjahre* (apprenticeship) and before his mastership can begin. In many guilds this custom is as old as their existence and continues still to be indispensable. It is said to have originated in the frequent journeys of the German emperors to Italy, and the consequent improvement observed in such workmen among their menials as had accompanied them thither.

\* Essay on Goethe.

So it happened that the seventeen-year-old shoemaker had must start out on his wanderings. First, he went to Ratisbon, thence to Passau, and thence to the picturesque town of Salzburg, where he found a school for mastersinging. He relates that at Wels in Upper Austria, in the year 1513, he resolved to cultivate the art of poetry as an intellectual recreation, in addition to his work as a shoemaker. His earliest poem appeared at this time, but he never regarded it as having especial merit. From Salzburg the young journeyman wandered to Munich, where he remained a year, becoming a director of the school for vocal music. Thence he traveled to the fine old city of Würzburg, on the River Main. It had an especial attraction for him, because here the famous early German poet, Walther von der Vogelweide, had ended his days and found his grave. Journeying toward the west, Sachs visited Frankfort and some of the cities on the Rhine. But he had now reached the fifth year of his wanderings; so he remained only a short time in each place, wending his way through the beautiful forests and quaint towns of Thuringia, until in 1516 he found himself again within the walls of his native city.

Among the noteworthy customs and rules of the trades it was a universal law that no journeyman could be recognized as a master workman until he had been "honorably married and had had a wedding." It therefore became Hans Sachs's business to find himself a wife. As he was by nature given to caution and deliberation, he appears to have devoted careful thought to the subject. Evidence of this is found in two Shrove Tuesday plays, produced in 1517 and 1518, and especially in a poem written in the latter year. In these he enforces the truth that true happiness is to be found only in married life, and his own subsequent experience proved the correctness of his theory. He sought as a life companion one who was capable in every respect, and he believed that he had found her in the person of Kunigunde Krenzer, an orphan from the neighboring village of Wendelstein. His parents approved his choice, and the wedding took place September 1, 1519. The house on the Kötgasse where Hans was born was presented to him by his father. Here, for several years, the young couple lived, and Sachs devoted himself to his trade. He failed to court the muse of poetry, preferring to wait until he should feel freer

from the necessity of providing for his temporal welfare. His industry was not unrewarded, for he soon became known as one of the most skillful and successful workmen in the city. In 1542 he bought a house on the other side of the river Pegnitz, in the Sebald quarter. The street is now called Hans Sachs Street; but the original residence is no longer standing. In its place are two small houses, on one of which is a tablet with the inscription, "Here lived Hans Sachs." Standing before it, one can almost imagine that he hears, issuing from the open window, the quick tap of the shoemaker's hammer or sees the poet among his books and papers, dealing the blows whose echoes still resound among the German people.

His marriage with Kunigunde proved to be a happy one. In his writings he often spoke jestingly, and even derisively, of the peculiarities of ill-natured women; but he did not find his examples or the cause for his satirical references in his own home. In the poem "The Bittersweet Married Life," a young man is made to report a conversation with "Meister Hans" on the advisability of marriage. In a long series of antitheses, with keen humor and a masterly command of language the poet portrays the light and the dark sides of married life. The lines begin,

My wife is my paradise;  
My purgatory likewise.

And the concluding sentences may be rendered,

She is my servant and my master,  
She is my wound as well as plaster,  
She is my heart's dear dwelling place,  
But makes my hair grow gray apace.

Allowance must be made here for poetical license. Sachs knew very well that all marriages did not turn out as happily as his own; and the twinkle of his eye as he penned these lines had in it nothing but love for his "dear Kunigunde."

During these years which Hans Sachs devoted to his family and his shoemaking the new doctrines which emanated from the cloister at Wittenberg were rapidly spreading. In Nuremberg Willibald Pirkheimer was regarded as a forerunner of the Reformation. He was included in the papal bull against the reformers, but in later years maintained a more and more conservative attitude. The real leader of the Nuremberg Reforma-



tion was Lazarus Spengler, first secretary of the council and Luther's faithful champion. In 1519 he published a defense of Luther's doctrines, and was the representative of the city at the Diet of Worms. The city council endeavored, however, to restrain the zealous adherents of the great reformer, and even forbade the sale of his writings. This action was taken out of respect to the position of the emperor. The council deemed it better to take no decided stand, either for one party or the other, but to await developments. When the Diet was held in Nuremberg, in 1522, there were great church festivities. Gorgeous processions marched through the streets; priests and prelates, elaborately arrayed, dazzled the eyes of beholders. But all these evidences of wealth, power, and glory made no permanent impression. They could not restrain the great popular current which had already set in toward the new doctrines.

For several years no poetical production had issued from the shoemaker's workshop. About this time his wife noticed that her husband was more given to meditation than usual, that he often took long walks alone through the fields and in the Laurenzer woods, spending many hours away from home. When she asked him about it he replied that he was thinking. Every evening he sat at his table, often until late at night, reading and studying various books and small pamphlets, which he bought secretly and read with as much avidity as though the salvation of his soul depended on them. Day and night his thoughts became occupied with what the Augustinian monk so clearly and so forcibly proclaimed. He managed to obtain a copy of the suppressed Nuremberg edition of the theses against indulgences and brought it home as a great treasure. Numerous editions of Luther's early writings were being issued, not only from Wittenberg, but from Leipsic, Strasburg, and Basel. They were widely circulated, and Sachs eagerly sought them. When the tract *An Address to the Christian Nobles of the German Nation* appeared the humble shoemaker thought that it would scarcely be adapted to his taste and circumstances. But when he read the bold words which Luther used in the Introduction—"God will help his Church by means of the laity, since the clergy, whose duty it was, have become altogether careless about it"—the poet of the people felt himself called

upon to utter his voice on the side of the Reformation. His whole nature was mightily stirred. The natural and inevitable result was the pouring forth of the famous poem, "The Wittenberg Nightingale." It was a tribute of love and admiration to Martin Luther and, at the same time, an announcement of his own evangelical faith.

The entire poem is allegorical. The nightingale is, as the title indicates, Martin Luther. His singing heralds the dawning of the day. His notes are strong and far reaching. They well represent the widespread effect of Luther's doctrines, as well as the strength and beauty of his writings. The song of the nightingale awakens the sheep (the Christians), thus arousing the anger of the lion (Pope Leo), who attempts to destroy the nightingale by sending the wolves after it. But the flock of sheep leave the wilderness, following the notes of the nightingale and escaping the wolves (bishops and abbots) and the serpents (the monks and nuns), who have so long deceived, betrayed, and sought to devour them. The traffic in indulgences, the reading of masses, the worship of the saints, the torments of purgatory, and all the long list of errors with which the priests endeavored to maintain dominion over their poor, deluded victims are pictured with remarkable vividness, unsurpassed wealth of language, and with scathing sarcasm. The shaven heads, the long prayers, the burning of candles, the carrying of banners, the offering of incense, the baptism of bells, the selling of grace, the consecration of salt and wax and water—all this and much more of the same sort constitute "the pope's divine service." Opponents of Luther are represented, according to a common custom of the time, as animals. Emser is the buck, the name which had already been applied to him by Luther; Dr. Eck, the wild boar. The learned men who directed their polemics against Luther are pictured as "croaking frogs," while the uneducated who failed to respect him because they could not comprehend him are "wild geese." The poem consists of seven hundred lines, and gives a vivid and comprehensive representation of the entire Reformation movement. Toward the close the poet rises to a high pitch of moral indignation against the tyranny of priestcraft and exhorts all Christians "to stand by the word of God," for "the end of the dominion of the true antichrist will surely come."

He declares that the sinful and doomed Babylon of which Daniel wrote has its fulfillment in the papacy; and, therefore, he calls upon all believers to

Return from the wilderness,  
To our shepherd, Jesus Christ.  
A good shepherd he is,  
Prevented our death by his;  
Our help in adversity,  
Our hope for eternity.  
Let all who believe in his name,  
Now join in a loud "Amen."

The first edition of this poem bears no date; but Sachs in his writings gives its date as "the eighth day of July, 1523." On the title-page, underneath a rough woodcut which covers nearly the entire page, are the words from Luke xix, 40, "I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out." The woodcut represents a nightingale sitting on a tree, under which are the lion and the other animals named in the poem, while upon a mountain in the background stands the Lamb, with the banner of victory. The inscription at the head of the Preface reads, "To all lovers of evangelical truth Johannes Sachs, shoemaker, wishes grace and peace in Christ Jesus our Lord." The "Wittenberg Nightingale" may be considered as the poetical masterpiece of Hans Sachs. The effect which the author sought to produce was achieved in a far higher degree than he could have expected. The poem made an extraordinary impression. During the first year six different editions were issued. It is referred to by many other writers of the period. Some, like Cochläus, the bitter anti-Lutheran of Frankfort-on-the-Main, sneered at the shoemaker; and others, like the artist Greifenberger, defended him and praised the poem.

The remarkable popularity which this composition attained encouraged the author to continue to champion the cause of the reformers. The next year he issued four popular *Theological Dialogues*, the only samples of prose among all the thousands of his productions. These are written in a style which was very attractive to the masses. The weaknesses of the Catholic clergy, their ignorance of the Scriptures and of the history of the Church, their love for gain and for a life of indolence—these are brought out with a freshness and irony that are ex-

ceedingly effective. Sachs shows how well versed he was in the Bible and how firmly he had grounded his faith in the word of God. He was probably well acquainted with the Bible before Luther appeared, although he did not possess one himself; but it was not until he purchased a copy of Luther's translation that he began to really make the Scriptures a subject of study. His skillful use of texts was one of his chief weapons in attacking the abuses of the Church. In the last of these dialogues, "A Conversation of an Evangelical Christian with a Lutheran," he manifests the spirit of moderation and toleration with which he regarded the controversies which were raging around him. He endeavored to restrain the extreme zeal of the Lutherans against the Catholics, claiming that the latter should be overcome by the word of God, and, wherever the Scriptures allowed, their practices should be treated with tolerance.\* Sachs did not attempt to incorporate in his poetry a tirade against the Catholics or to overwhelm them in polemical discussions. He sought rather, by the use of the legitimate arts of poetry, to present the existing evils in such a light that the people would be compelled to rid themselves of them. He also rendered an especial service to the cause of the Reformation by his influence upon its hymnology. He changed many Catholic hymns so that they should be in harmony with what he believed to be a pure Christianity. For the name of Mary and of various saints that of Jesus was substituted. He also composed several new hymns and versified some of the psalms, arranging them for use in church singing. In 1527 a collection of hymns and psalms appeared, in which those of Sachs stood with those of Luther.

In the years 1539 and 1540 Sachs produced two poems of a more serious tone, in which he complained in most painful terms of the decline of the Reformation and the gradual disappearance of many of its most valued acquisitions. The first of these, styled "Martyred Theology," represents theology as a much-abused woman. It describes in detail all the martyrdoms she has endured, and pictures in an unenviable light the various sects and parties which were the chief actors in bringing

\* Opponents of the Reformation have not failed to make use of the sharp reproofs which Sachs administered to the impatient, and sometimes immoral, Lutherans of his day. In Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzergeschichte* quotations from the above dialogue are introduced to prove the cause of the decline of the Reformation.

about the existing desolation in the theological world. "The Complaining Gospel" is a plea for God's word. It has delivered man from a long night of error, only to be again forsaken by him and to be despised and perverted. So disheartened is the poet at the threatening loss of all that has been so happily attained that he declares, "If Christ himself should come and accept his own word the narrow-minded throng would crucify him again as an erring deceiver, a rebel, and a murderer." He concludes the complaint with a heartfelt prayer to God that he may preserve to us his holy word, that by it we may be "inflamed through every part—body, soul, head, and heart," and that men may again be established in the true faith. It deeply grieved him that so many of the adherents of the Reformation failed to recognize that the purified faith they had received included a new and a higher moral law, and that they were under obligation to live according to it. Similar complaints were made by Pirkheimer; but, in contrast with Sachs, Pirkheimer's testimony must be discounted, for he lacked a firm evangelical faith, and his own private life was not above reproach.

The sudden death of Martin Luther, on the eighteenth of February, 1546, was a severe blow to all the Protestants, and few of them felt it more keenly than the shoemaker-poet. It was the occasion of a new evidence of his firm adherence to the cause of evangelical truth. Moved by his own grief, he wrote his "Epitaph to Doctor Martin Luther," a noble tribute to the consummate worth of the great reformer and a witness to the high regard in which he was held by the common people. The following rendering will give an idea of the contents of the poem, though it lacks the terse, vigorous expression and the melodious rhythm of the old German original. The poet says:

I thought myself in a temple built in the Saxon style, brightly illumined by candles, and filled with the odor of incense. Before the altar stood a catafalque covered with a pall. Above it hung a shield adorned with a rose, in whose center was a cross.\* I cried, "O, God! what means this?" I thought, "What if this were the dead body of Dr. Martin Luther?" Presently there advanced from the choir, in snow-white garb, a matron whose name is Theologia. She stood by the bier of the dead; she wrung her hands and burst into passionate tears. With sobs she began and said: "Liest thou there, and art thou dead, O thou hero

\* It will be remembered that this was Luther's coat of arms.

true and bold, chosen of God to fight for me so valiantly? Thou didst overcome my enemy by the word of God, by discussion, writing, and preaching. Thou hast led me forth from the great tribulation of my Babylonian captivity, in which I lay so long that I was well-nigh forgotten. My captors dragged me back and forth. My snowy raiment was soiled and torn. I was so bruised, wounded, and disfigured by their godless, human doctrines that one would scarcely have known me. My foes despised me, and I was counted as naught. At last thou, O noble hero, by the grace of God didst set me free. Thou didst bathe my wounds; thou didst cleanse my garments from falsehood and deceit; thou didst anoint me and heal me, so that now I am fully restored, strong, and pure as in the beginning. In the accomplishment of this great task thy life has often been endangered. Pope, bishop, king, and prince have thirsted for thy blood. But as one of God's heroes thou hast ever remained steadfast, faithful, and true, turning aside for no danger, and ever pursuing the pathway of God and of the truth. But, now that thou hast departed, who will be my defender? What will be my fate, so unhappy and desolate am I in the midst of my enemies?" "I will answer thee [replies the poet]. Fear thou not; be of good courage, thou holy one. God himself hath thee in his keeping. He hath given thee in abundance many noble men, who still live and who are well able to protect thee. Yea, the entire multitude of Christians shall stand thy guard, for thou hast become known throughout the length and breadth of the Fatherland. None of them will forsake thee. They will preserve thee from the vast multitude of errors taught by men. No power or craft can harm thee. The gates of hell shall not prevail against thee. Therefore, let thy mourning be only for this—that Dr. Martin, conqueror and victor, a truly apostolic warrior, who has finished the fight on earth and broken the might of thine enemies, hath now, by the tender mercy of God, been summoned to his eternal rest." And that Christ may help us all, after the misery of life, to enter into eternal joy—this is the prayer of Hans Sachs.

Death came still nearer to the poet in 1560, when his "be-loved companion," Kunigunde, was taken from him. The blow was the more severe because he was left entirely alone, all of their seven children having died previously. The genuineness of his sorrow for his wife is touchingly manifested in his poem written in her memory. It is one of the pearls of his poetical compositions. In this same year Sachs made a "general register" of all the poems which he had written. Their number is astonishing. In this list he gives the names of nearly fifty-four hundred. These were subsequently increased to more than six thousand. He even surpassed Luther, and is probably the most prolific writer whom the German nation has

produced. The larger part of these writings are still extant. Several editions of his poems were published during his lifetime. In 1870 the Stuttgart Literary Society began the publication of a complete edition of his works. The volumes are critically edited, and, thus far, twenty-one of them have appeared. Hans Sachs died on the evening of the nineteenth of January, 1576, being in his eighty-second year. He was buried in the Cemetery of St. John, just outside the city, where lay the bodies of Albert Dürer and other noted men of Nuremberg. But, strange to say, like John Calvin's at Geneva, his grave is no longer definitely known. Thus ended the life of one of the most unique characters in German history.

The writings of the Nuremberg shoemaker present no great poetical problems. Whatever he thought and felt he expressed distinctly and clearly. The lucidity of his style is one of its chief attractions. It was to this characteristic, more than to any other, that he owed his widespread popularity. As one reads page after page of his poems and notices continually how smoothly, how naturally, how melodiously flows the current of thought and of language the impression is irresistible that this man was a master of the forms of literary expression. He understood the art of producing suspense in the mind of the reader, and he often used it to great advantage. He does not disclose at once all the details of the scene which he wishes to put before the imagination, but allows these to come to light incidentally. The description is mingled with the action of the poem. It is all the more effective because unnoticed. His style has a peculiar charm in its quaint simplicity. In the "Creation, Fall, and Expulsion of Adam from Paradise" he pictures, in a very naïve manner, Eve's alarm whenever God visits her and Adam's instruction of his boys, as he tells them how to behave before God, how to take off their hats, bow, and give God their hand.

The unique position of Hans Sachs in the history of German literature is worthy of special mention. He is the sole representative of German poetry during the Reformation period. That no other poets were produced has often led to the charge that the Reformation was antagonistic to the advancement of literature. (Thus, Paul Lacroix writes: "The Reformation, it must be said, was everywhere fatal to language



and literature; and it dealt an especially severe blow at German poetry. Hans Sachs, the Nuremberg shoemaker, is, perhaps, the only poet who, trying his hand at all branches of poetry, ventured to brave the Lutheran intolerance." \* While it is true that there is no other great name in German poetry during this century, it must not be overlooked that a similar statement can be made concerning countries which were not touched by the Lutheran Reformation. It would be difficult to find in the literature of any other nation a single great name that lends literary luster to the first half of the sixteenth century. The Reformation dawned at a time when German national literature was at its lowest ebb. Hitherto, the intellectual life of the people had been limited to a very small circle and confined within a very narrow range. It had been made to conform to the modes of expression current in other languages. The Reformation brought with it new forces, which created a new literary epoch. The Germans were impelled to cultivate their own language, to utilize their own habits of thought, and to develop the inherent resources of their own national life. It is true that the evidences of this intellectual regeneration were not immediately manifested in any marked degree. There was no widespread literary activity. The reason plainly was that the Reformation itself produced such a moral upheaval that the awakening intelligence of the nation everywhere turned its attention and directed its energies toward the profound moral and ecclesiastical problems thus suddenly revealed. It was an age of action, rather than of expression, but action which was inevitably followed by expression. The turmoil and unrest of the Reformation age furnished the elements for the rich literary deposits of the succeeding centuries.

After the middle of the seventeenth century the popularity of Hans Sachs began to wane. The reasons were his unexampled productivity and the changes which had taken place in the German language during the previous hundred years. The people no longer understood the old form of speech in which Sachs had written. For the poet's literary resurrection we are chiefly indebted to Goethe. He gave a true picture of the man in his poem "Hans Sachs's Poetical Mission." He taught

\* *Science and Literature in the Middle Ages*, p. 448. Lacroix is a Parisian Catholic, and classes Wyclif, Huss, and Luther among the "heresiarchs."

Wieland to admire him, and the Weimar essayist praised the Nuremberg poet in prose, wrote tales in the Hans Sachs manner, and sought to enrich his vocabulary from old German sources. The influence which Sachs exercised over Goethe, Scherer says, is "traceable in his satirical dramas, in little didactic plays, in his poem written in praise of the old master himself, and, above all, in 'Faust.'" \* Goethe began to write "Faust" in prose; but when he became familiar with Hans Sachs and his peculiar style he determined to put the story into its appropriate old German setting and to write in verse. It is thus to the poet of the Reformation that we are indebted for the final impulse which gave to the world the most celebrated dramatic poem in German literature.

Hans Sachs is the greatest "people's poet" whom the German nation has yet produced. He was himself a man of the people. Birth, training, trade, and personal temperament gave him a large sympathy with the struggling masses. As late as his sixty-third year he worked at his shoemaker's bench. He loved the common people. He lived for them, wrote of them, and spoke to them. The multitude of his poems on domestic and industrial life comprehends everything which a close observer saw around him. There is no important element of his times which he has not touched. From his poems it would be possible to construct a picture of the Reformation age which would be the most complete and most reliable ever presented by any writer. Schiller says, "The poet is a citizen, not only of his country, but of his times." If he be judged by this criterion Hans Sachs will be placed among the world's greatest poets.

\*Scherer, *History of German Literature*, vol. II, p. 100.

*N. Walling Clark.*

### ART. III—THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AS A WORKING BODY.

It is probable that several changes will be made, in the not distant future, in our General Conference system. Leaving constitutional questions to others, we propose now to examine the practical workings of the General Conference in the past, that we may discover how to secure the highest efficiency of this legislative body of the Church for the years to come. The subject will be presented under three heads: (1) the number of members composing the Conference; (2) the length of its sessions; (3) its methods of work.

I. The number of the members is variable from one session to another. Some provision should be made to reduce this variation to a minimum. It is generally believed that a deliberative body of more than two or three hundred members is necessarily unwieldy and unfitted for proper work. A careful study of the Conference at work will correct this mistaken judgment. The national political conventions called quadrennially to nominate candidates for president and vice president and to adopt platforms for the parties they represent are not unwieldy; yet they contain approximately three hundred more members than our own General Conference and five hundred more than that of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. A comparison of these two Conferences will be instructive. The last General Conference of the Southern Church, held at Memphis in 1894, was composed of 343 delegates, while our own General Conference at Omaha, in 1892, numbered 504. The smaller body has already provided for reducing its number about twenty-five per cent; and a proposition for reducing the size of our own body is now before the Church. It appears to the writer, from personal observation of the two Conferences at their work—the smaller at St. Louis and Memphis, the larger at Cincinnati, New York, and Omaha—that the advantage is clearly with the larger body, and that an assembly of five hundred delegates is not too cumbersome for legislation. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has reduced the size of her General Conference before it had reached that best suited for such work. To those who believe that a great re-

duction in numbers would cure most of the infirmities of the great assembly of our Church the following facts and observations are submitted for consideration.

At the General Conference held in New York in 1888 there were 463 delegates. The highest number at any time present and voting was 459, leaving 4 absent or not voting. Fourteen counted votes, taken on different days, show an average of 35 absent or not voting. The Southern General Conference held at Memphis in 1894 consisted of 343 members. In each of the three largest votes taken the number of voters was 296, or 47 less than the total membership of the Conference. The average number voting in fourteen counted votes was 258, or 85 less than the total number. Comparing fourteen counted votes in each of the two Conferences, the proportion of members absent or not voting was over three times greater in the smaller body than in the larger. The attendance of members in their seats indicates, in a general way, the estimate put upon the importance of legislation. But the difference may be attributed, in part, to the better accommodations enjoyed by the larger body. In the unfinished auditorium at Omaha the conditions were not so favorable as in New York, either as regards the seating facilities or the acoustic properties of the hall. But even the Omaha Conference of 504 delegates—nearly fifty per cent larger than the Southern body—shows a better percentage of members present and voting than the Memphis Conference, which assembled in a church. The highest vote at Omaha showed 484 members voting and 20 absent or not voting. Fourteen votes on different days disclosed an average of 50 absent or not voting. It is worthy of note, in passing, that when the New York General Conference was brought to an end for want of a quorum more than two thirds of the ministerial delegates were present, while only about three sevenths of the laymen were in their seats. At Omaha an aye and no vote was taken May 25, and only 10 ministers were found absent or not voting, while 36 of the laymen did not vote. The Southern General Conference contains a larger proportion of laymen, the two orders being equally represented; but as no division occurred at the last session between the ministerial and lay delegates it is not easy to discover the comparative attendance of the two orders.

A Southern bishop said at Memphis, in the presence of one of our fraternal delegates, that he should be sorry to see the day when their Conference should become so large as to be compelled to go elsewhere than to a church to hold its sessions. But one of the advantages for work enjoyed by our General Conference comes from the fact that, when it became too large to find accommodation within a church, it sought a place better adapted to its purposes than any church building could possibly be. The weariness of the flesh resulting from a four hours' sitting in pews without support for the arms causes restlessness both in body and mind—a condition unfavorable to the best legislation. It has been urged in favor of holding the sessions in the auditorium of a church that the place serves as a wholesome restraint upon the members during the discussions. But the facts fail to support this claim. What may be called turbulent vehemence in debate, not to mention the use of irrelevant and biting personalities, does not oftener mar the proceedings of the larger body in its hall than those of the smaller body in its church. A few "sons of thunder" among Methodist legislators lose themselves in the ardor of debate wherever they may happen to be. The difficulty experienced in hearing the speakers in a large body is often presented as an argument in favor of small deliberative bodies. But this would prove too much; for some speakers would not be easily heard in an assembly of only two hundred delegates. At the Memphis Conference, with only about three hundred usually present and with the farthest row of pews only thirteen from the platform, there was as much difficulty experienced in keeping order and in hearing the speakers as in the large Exposition Hall at Omaha, at a Conference having half again as many members and four times as many visitors. With the present numbers in our General Conference, "unwieldiness" is a question of location and methods rather than of bulk.

Another matter has been advanced as favoring the smaller number—namely, the greater expense incident to the meeting of a large body of delegates. While an amount of nearly \$36,000 is large in the aggregate, yet when divided among the whole membership of the Church it is barely one cent and a half once every four years per member—a sum too insignificant to be called a burden upon the Church. It cost the

Southern Church about \$18,700, or a little less than a cent and a half per member to pay the expenses of her General Conference at Memphis. But the delegates received notice that they must pay their own board if they remained beyond the fifteenth day's session; and the Conference was afterward extended to the sixteenth day. It is hardly just to grumble about the cost of travel and board of delegates who get no compensation for their labors. A wise economy would insure a large but judicious expenditure, in order to secure the most convenient place for the meetings and provide all possible facilities for the work.

Another question for consideration is the provision to be made for the accommodation of spectators. Says the *Western Christian Advocate* of May 16, 1894:

The first obligation of a General Conference is to the Church, not to the lobby. We would do well to follow the example of the Church, South, in having our General Conference committees sit with closed doors. We would do well to go further and have the sessions of the General Conference with closed doors. Eliminate the galleries from the problem, and the question of time for business becomes much simpler.

This utterance appears to us to have been made without reflection. The galleries are not filled with lobbyists, but with loyal and honorably interested Methodists—"devout men, out of every nation under heaven." It is not proper for any legislative body to transact its business in secret session. When a statesman speaks on some question of national interest the halls of Congress are crowded with spectators. So must it ever be when churchmen speak in the chief council of our Zion. Deeply interested multitudes will be there to listen, and the discussions will be the better for their presence. The number of visitors who attend the business sessions of our General Conference is much larger than that attending the meetings of the Southern Conference at either St. Louis or Memphis. Nor have the committees any need to exclude visitors, except on special occasions, which can be provided for as the needs arise. Our Conference has a decided advantage over that of the Southern Church, in that its principal committees are large enough to be representative bodies, and are thus fully competent to give thorough discussion to important questions

before they are presented for final action to the Conference itself. This is of great importance and goes far toward supplying the need for two houses of legislation. The committees, being unincumbered with routine business, have ample time for a thorough consideration of important questions.

II. With the great increase in membership and the opening up of new lines of work and new fields of activity necessitating much additional legislation, there is, nevertheless, a noticeable tendency to hurry through the business and shorten the sessions of the General Conference. The unseemly haste toward the close of the session should not be encouraged. Newspapers often congratulate the people upon the final adjournment of a legislature, as if it were an evil to be endured and the end of it a joyful relief. Shall we form the same low estimate of our chief assembly? Some who stand high enough to give their words a wide range of influence have uttered words that encourage the movement toward shorter sessions. The following will serve as a sample: "The General Conference will become more and more an unsettling and disturbing element in the Church." We have come upon times when important interests of our world-wide Methodism demand patient and careful consideration; but our General Conference of 1892 closed on the twenty-first day of the session, or six days earlier than the preceding General Conference.

Has the presence of laymen contributed to this haste? The General Conference of the Church, South, contains laymen in equal numbers with the ministerial delegates; and its session of last year was much shorter than ours at Omaha, adjourning on the sixteenth day. Barely fifteen minutes were given to the discussion of the subject of the federation of Methodisms on the day before the final adjournment. But their haste on the closing day is strikingly shown in a protest, signed by forty-eight members of the Conference, "against the hasty action of this body by which two entire chapters of the Discipline, covering the methods of trial and appeal of bishops, traveling preachers, and members, were adopted, without opportunity for due consideration, and even before the paper had been read to the body." In our own Conference, from the first day, a spirit of hurry seizes upon the members. Toward the close this spirit has obtained complete mastery. A call for the pre-



vious question or a motion to lay on the table can be relied upon to cut off discussion on questions demanding the most careful consideration. Deliberation, in any true sense of the word, is impossible under the five-minute rule and amid the general hurry that marks the closing days and tumultuous ending of our sessions. The last day at Omaha furnished a striking example of action taken without due deliberation in the strange proposition, sent down to be acted upon by the Annual Conferences, on the matter of the admission of women into the General Conference.

For this mischievous tendency both the causes and the remedy should be diligently sought. Personal convenience appears to determine the time of departure of many delegates, who seem to feel no sense of obligation to the Church at large or to the Conferences whose representatives they are. It would add much to the working power of the General Conference to eliminate the member who comes proposing only to remain two weeks, or until "his man" is elected. It would be well to dispense with the much-visiting member who comes chiefly to see the city. It might be of advantage, also, to require the chairman of each delegation to report the number of hours each member is absent from his seat. In the committees it often happens that a newly seated alternate or a member who has been "seeing the city" comes in to vote upon a question that has been thoroughly canvassed in his absence. It is not easy to decide which is of greater detriment to wise legislation—a vacant seat or one occupied by two or even three different persons during the session. The trouble, however, is much greater in the smaller General Conference—that of the Church, South—than in our own. Both of these matters—this haste in getting through with the business of the session, and this culpable inattention to the responsibilities assumed—are mischievous in their tendencies and unworthy of those who have accepted the position of representatives in the highest legislative body in the Church.

III. Much time is saved in our General Conference by making the action of the Committee on Boundaries so far final that the questions involved do not come before the Conference for consideration. This sort of work, usually of local interest, can best be done in committee. More time could be saved if

the election of all general secretaries and official editors were removed from the General Conference. Some better way of holding these elections could certainly be devised. Committee work, too, would be greatly improved if the smaller Annual Conferences should surrender or be deprived of their separate representation, and should, instead, be grouped together into and represented by districts, so that every General Conference delegation should consist of at least four members. With the present number (twelve) of standing committees, meeting on alternate days, it requires a delegation of six members in order to be regularly represented at all committee meetings. About thirty-six Annual Conferences send but two delegates each. These delegates will with some regularity attend the meetings of two or three of the principal committees, but will pay only occasional visits to the others. Few, if any, of the committees have more than forty in regular attendance, out of a total enrollment of considerably over one hundred.

With a General Conference not varying much from our last one in point of numbers, that is to say, containing about five hundred members, the best legislative work can be done, if the other conditions for successful work are only maintained at their best. It will advance the welfare of the Church much more to give careful attention to securing a proper place for the holding of the session, to providing all attainable facilities for the work of the Conference, and to adopting right methods of procedure, than to cry for a short session and a smaller body, expecting to find in these a cure for present evils. In one respect a Methodist General Conference has a great advantage over those general assemblies of other Churches which elect their own presiding officers. With a bishop in the chair who has an extensive personal acquaintance among the delegates and who has had long experience in presiding over deliberative bodies, who is supported, too, by his colleagues on the platform, it is provided with a presidency that could hardly be excelled. The fault is not in the chair if the body be "unwieldy," nor in the presence of spectators, nor in the mere number of delegates.

Who, then, is the ideal delegate? Not necessarily the man who is oftenest on his feet or he who goes to the Conference with the greatest knowledge of the matters to be presented. The majority in any Conference will do little or no speaking,

except in committee; and very few will have given special study beforehand to one half the subjects upon which they will be called to vote. A member burdened with egotism or enamored of his own eloquence will learn little of a subject during a discussion; and the man of average attainments who listens well to all discussions, both in committee and in open Conference, will be apt to make the best and safest legislator, especially if he be not in too great haste to get home. Let men be chosen who realize that the magnitude of the interests placed in their hands imposes weighty and solemn obligations upon them for their best service. Let the Committee on Entertainment see that a building with good acoustic properties and with comfortable seats be provided. Let all conscientious delegates sit through the four hours' sessions for a month and a day, if need be. And let us hear no more about making the General Conference a small body. This business should not be done in a corner.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "J. D. Walsh". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned in the lower right quadrant of the page.

## ART. IV.—SALVABILITY OF HERETICS.

WE should suppose, from the controversies among Protestants over Roman Catholic doctrine, that the Roman Catholic Church was an obscure, shy sect of esoteric teachings, instead of filling Western history back almost to apostolic times and having proclaimed her tenets in a thousand authentic and public documents. It was really amusing some years ago to observe a Presbyterian clergyman communicating, with an air of mysterious astonishment, the results of a private interview with Archbishop Corrigan's secretary, to the effect that his Church allows that a good many Protestants may be saved. We should suppose, from the air of pleased surprise and innocent importance with which he made the announcement, that this opinion had been buried under the pyramids and had just been excavated by him, along with the mummy of Rameses the Great, for the general enlightenment. He seems not to have been aware that no opinion can bind a Catholic conscience unless proclaimed *urbi et orbi*, or unless universally taught in the Church as something essential to the faith. There is, therefore, no room for excavations or mysterious disclosures in the field of Roman Catholic doctrine. Opinions may be entertained more or less widely and with more or less of reserve; but, unless universally published and universally received as of dogmatic obligation, they cannot be enforced upon any Roman Catholic who chooses to deny them. He may be enjoined against publicly contradicting a widely spread opinion which is not of faith, but he cannot be required to profess it. Nor can we be sure that a doctrine is held by Rome to-day because she held it a thousand or fifteen hundred years ago. It is remarked by Dr. Döllinger that Rome, six hundred years back, burned people for teaching papal infallibility, and to-day she excommunicates them for denying it. Even Roman Catholics now very commonly accept Cardinal Newman's theory of development, according to which the general type of doctrine has always been the same in the Catholic Church (as indeed it has), but that this has been very slowly evolved, and, meanwhile, many opinions incompatible with it have long prevailed and often been inconsiderately enforced, as if they were of the faith. Whatever we may say of this theory

in general, in its relations to the infallibility of the Church, it seems not to work amiss as to the salvability of heretics, especially as it would, I think, be difficult to cite any instance of discipline inflicted on a Catholic, ancient or modern, for entertaining a charitable presumption as to the future destiny of pious schismatics whose schism has been inherited and has not originated with them.

As good a starting point as any in our consideration of this matter is Dr. Johann Anton Theiner's work, *Das Seligkeitsdogma der römisch-katholischen Kirche* ("The Roman Catholic Doctrine of Salvability"), published at Breslau in 1847. The names Theiner and Breslau suggest a Roman Catholic origin. However this may be, the work of over six hundred and fifty closely printed octavo pages, crowded with the most accurate learning, breathes from beginning to end the most unrelenting virulence against the Church of Rome. The author's aim is to prove that the Roman Catholic Church has always taught, and still teaches, that from the first Whitsuntide (or, at least, from the fall of the temple) till now no human being, baptized or unbaptized, infant or adult, dying out of visible communion with the see of Peter has ever been, or ever will be, saved. All pretenses to the contrary he declares to have been mere hypocritical appearances, assumed to beguile the unwary and lull them into an unsuspicious benevolence toward Rome, which shall make them easier victims of her proselytizing designs. Now, anyone who will attentively read Dr. Theiner's work will not fail to be persuaded of his ample competency to decide this matter. If he cannot establish his point no one can. Learning and ability being conceded, the only question is one of good faith.

Before considering this, however, let us admit, what everyone knows, that the Catholic Church from the time of her full development, as early as the year 200, has always taught unwaveringly that out of the Church there is no salvation. *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* is a formula that no Catholic, ancient or modern, Eastern or Western, has ever ventured to contradict, unless he stood prepared to forfeit his Catholic name. The only question has been one of interpretation. We need not concern ourselves much about the Eastern Church. Her ancient writers have been of a milder, and her modern of a narrower,

temper than the Western. Orthodoxy has been her great note, while catholicity has been emphatically embodied in the Church of Rome. With the latter, doctrinal error has been of less account than disobedience. False doctrine, however erroneous, even though it should confound the persons of the Trinity, to use Bellarmine's illustration, is not heresy, so long as the man stands prepared to accept whatever he learns that the Church has authentically defined. The true question, therefore, is with Rome, Can schismatics be saved? It is indifferent whether their schism declares itself in the rejection of an authentic doctrine or in disobedience to a legitimate command of the Church. However, as inward separation from the Church is most unequivocally exhibited in the rejection of defined doctrine, we need not change our title, provided we interpret it as including schismatics even though doctrinally sound, as the Greeks are admitted to be and as some Roman Catholics maintain that a large share of the Anglicans are.

Theiner, who must not be confused with his brother, an eminent Catholic divine, is right in taking Augustine as the decisive authority as to the ancient Catholic doctrine of salvability. However, he raises a strong presumption against the honesty of his attitude toward Augustine by hurling at him the hateful term *Frömmeler*, "a pretender to piety," and holding up against him the excesses of his earlier life as a proof that the devout sobriety of his later years was put on for sinister ends. Now, I need not defend the noble sincerity of Augustine's conversion against Theiner or against any other ignoble adversary. Nor need I vindicate his right to that symbol of the flaming heart which the Roman Church, with the marvelous justice of her appreciations of her great saints, has assigned to him. But I mention Theiner's scoffing disparagement as the keynote to the tone of his whole book. It is thoroughly scientific in form and utterly unscientific in fact, having no more moral title to respect than any one of our coarsest and most blundering polemical tracts. This shows that scientific temperance would not establish his contention, and that he resorts to unworthy virulence for this reason. However, he surveys the whole field of the controversy with so ample a sweep of view that we cannot do better than in this respect to follow his lead.

Augustine and the whole Catholic Church of his day doubtless held that outside the pale of baptism justifying grace is not given. A virtuous heathen might not be condemned to torment; although the fathers are by no means so indulgent in this as the schoolmen and the modern Catholic divines. But at all events he would never be admitted into the kingdom of heaven. Yet even here we must make a profoundly important exception. Augustine declares that most of the Christians of his day denied the eternity of future punishment. Nor will he allow them to be called heretics. He commends their compassionateness and is willing to concede that eternal punishments may be from time to time remitted, or even altogether intermitted—an opinion very commonly prevalent throughout the later ages, and one to which the Church seems never to have raised any opposition. However, he insists that Scripture makes it plain that we cannot go farther than this. He and the Church of his day, of course, held that whoever is baptized in the Catholic Church, not being in mortal sin, is forgiven and justified, and, dying in this state, is saved. He also holds that whoever is, with due matter, form, and intent, baptized out of the Catholic Church receives the sacrament, indeed, but not the grace of the sacrament. If, now, he comes into the Church, then, having already the baptismal character, he first receives the baptismal grace. But who are baptized in the Catholic Church? Only those that are baptized by Catholic Christians? Theiner answers for him, "Yes." Augustine answers for himself as follows: "Those who defend their own opinion, however false and perverse, with no pertinacious animosity, especially when they have not engendered it by the audacity of their own presumption, but have received it from lapsed parents led away into error, and seek the truth with cautious solicitude, being prepared to be set right when they have discovered it, are in no way to be reckoned among heretics"—*nequaquam sunt inter hæreticos deputandi*. It follows, then, that all such persons, even though not baptized by Catholics, have been baptized in the Catholic Church and have been made partakers of justifying grace.

To this Theiner, who adduces the passage at length, replies that Augustine wrote it before he was firmly fixed in orthodoxy; that he addresses it to Donatist bishops, whose good



will he wished to gain ; that the whole letter shows him to confine it to those who were just ready to come over ; and that his whole subsequent life agrees with this last assumption. How far he may have recognized any particular Donatists as exemplifying his principle I cannot say. Men in controversies so intense as this which laid Africa waste seldom show much practical charity. But there his *dictum* is, plain in its terms, received into the canon law, still authoritative in the Church, and certainly lending itself much more easily to a large, than to a narrow, interpretation. Dr. Theiner, however, when Melchior, Bishop of Diepenbrock, about 1850, in a pastoral letter, quotes this declaration of Augustine and its reception into the canon law as a proof that "the Catholic Church accounts as still belonging to her those who, incorporated with her by baptism, remain outwardly estranged from her on earth by reason of innocent error," flies out against him as a hypocritical deceiver endeavoring to mislead the world for the dark designs of his Church. Inasmuch as the pastorals of a Catholic prelate, though not supposed infallible, are of high doctrinal authority for his diocesans unless reversed by Rome—which it appears that this pastoral was not—it follows that Melchior, to deceive Protestants, has set himself to mislead his own people from the faith ! It is hard to say whether this imputation is the more odious or the more ridiculous.

How absolutely Theiner in this controversy, for all his learning, is devoid of common honesty, as a man of so virulent a temper of necessity always is, appears from the fact that in this very place—after showing that, with hardly an exception, Catholic divines held baptism, except for martyrs, to be in every conceivable case indispensable for salvation, until St. Bernard and the schoolmen after him allowed that the baptism of desire suffices where that of water cannot be had—he remarks that this has never become a Church doctrine, and that the Council of Trent, Session VII, Canon V (erroneously given IV), *De Baptismo*, declares baptism necessary to salvation. Undoubtedly it does ; but in what sense ? In the sense that the application of water is always necessary ? Then the baptism of blood in martyrdom would be excluded, which Theiner admits that the Church receives. Since, then, we see, even on Theiner's showing, that by calling baptism necessary the Council does not

mean that the external rite is always requisite, the author's appeal to the word *necessarium* is of no force. It does not of itself exclude the baptism of volition. Does the Council, even while not denying this, neglect it? No. In the same session Canon IV, *De Sacramentis in Genere*, reads: "If anyone shall say that the sacraments of the new law are not necessary to salvation, but superfluous, and that without them, *or the earnest desire of them* [*eorum voto*], men, by faith alone, obtain from God the grace of justification, although all are not necessary for everyone, *anathema sit.*" Here the clause which I have emphasized gives the Council's own interpretation of *necessarium*. It instructs us authoritatively that the Church, in declaring baptism necessary for all, the eucharist necessary for all of full age, and penance necessary for all falling into mortal sin after baptism, means that the defect of these sacraments, where inevitable, is supplied by the earnest desire of them—*votum sacramenti*.

It is not true, then, as Theiner affirms, that the baptism of volition, as sufficing where the external rite cannot be had, has not become a Church doctrine. It has been indissolubly connected by the Council of Trent with the baptism of water, as its adequate substitute in case of necessity. Dr. Theiner, of course, is perfectly well aware that it has become a mere commonplace of Roman Catholic theology, alike of learned treatises and of popular catechisms. It may be that the anathema of the Council does not formally strike the denial of it when separated from the whole canon; but neither does an anathema strike the denial of the absolute indissolubility of Christian marriage, which yet the Council of Trent treats as undoubtedly the true Catholic doctrine. Accordingly, the Inquisition at Goa, having learned that a young Frenchman, besides a want of respect to the Holy Office itself, had once denied that the baptism of volition could ever suffice, condemned him to five years in the galleys for this inconsiderate speech. It is true that the King of Portugal annulled the sentence—not, however, as bad theology, but for fear of trouble with France. Indeed, the immaculate conception of Mary is not by any means established on as certain a basis of authority as the baptism of desire. Accordingly, the Roman Catechism, drawn up by direction of Trent and, though not of dogmatic obligation, yet

the true representative of Tridentine theology, instructs the parish clergy that they should see to it that infants are baptized as soon after birth as possible, but that they should delay the baptism of catechumens until they are fully instructed, inasmuch as they, having already the baptism of volition, will not be deprived of eternal life if called out of the world without the external sacrament.

It has been suggested, by some who can hardly bear to admit that the Church of Rome allows the possibility of salvation without external baptism, that, at least, she only extends it to those who die suddenly while they are actually preparing for it. To this it suffices to answer that the Council of Trent makes no such limitation; and it is certain that modern Roman Catholic theology makes none. Thus, the Abbé Hue, traveling from Thibet to China in company with a very foul-mouthed heathen mandarin who died suddenly on the journey, violates no canon of orthodoxy in expressing the hope—confessedly a faint one—that God may have granted him “the baptism of desire” with his parting breath. Hue’s book was put on the *Index*, but not for this. This question, whether the unbaptized may be saved, does not immediately bear on the salvability of heretics, since a catechumen is not a heretic. Yet the way was opened for wider and yet wider conceptions of God’s redeeming purposes as one wall of exclusion after another fell under the expanding force of the Christian consciousness. When Rome, about the year 250, breasted the whole current of Catholic opinion in Africa and Asia by contending for, and after long controversy carrying through, the position that heretical baptism, rightly administered and intended, was valid, she then, as Dr. Schaff remarks, opened a back door by which the spirit of Christian brotherhood has continually reëntered as often as hierarchical pride has driven it out by the front. Hierarchical pride, or a temper which Protestants cannot distinguish from it, has undoubtedly thus far prevailed in her relations to Christians divided from her, and has shaped her official, and most of her theological, language; but the happy decision of the third century has not allowed her to treat Christians out of communion with her as no Christians. The tone of brotherhood is as yet far from controlling; but it has become, of course with abundant exceptions and relapses, gradually more and more decided, although often in strange contrast

with the literal sense of established formulas; and since, at least, the time of Benedict XIV, who died in 1758, and still more of Clement XIV, who abolished the Maundy Thursday reading of the hateful bull of universal excommunication *In Cœna Domini*, the spirit of brotherhood has gradually invaded even the official declarations of Rome, and—though even here with some very unhappy exceptions—has never been more decided than in the tone of the excellent man who fills the papal chair at present. But I shall revert to this farther on.

Theiner says no more than the truth in remarking that the concession of validity to heretical baptism has often been galling to Catholic arrogance and has provoked strong reactions. Since Nicæa, these must be evasive; and in the form of evasion they show themselves very unpleasantly at present toward Protestantism. It is true, a great part of the Protestants of England and America rebaptize Roman Catholics coming over to them; but this does not excuse Rome for going back from her own principles by allowing so general a rebaptizing, even though *sub conditione*, of converts from Protestantism. She pleads, indeed, that Anglo-Saxon Protestants are so negligent in baptizing that she can never be sure that converts have actually been touched by the sacramental water. Yet this will certainly not apply to Baptists, whom she occasionally receives and whom, like the rest, she rebaptizes provisionally. It seems evident that we have here to deal, not with ritual scrupulousness alone, but with a strong reaction of sectarian exclusiveness. She does not allege the invalidity of our ministry, inasmuch as she receives lay baptism, though ordinarily irregular, as always competent for validity. Were it not that this ungracious usage appears to be mostly restricted to the countries of English speech, and that it still veils itself under the form of hypothetical repetition, there would be danger that this last thin link of visible Christian unity would be altogether snapped. It is true that, since the doctrine of virtual baptism has come up, and, still more, that of implied desire—*votum implicitum*—the results in widening the rent are by no means so disastrous as they would once have been. The widely accepted view now is that loyalty to the mind of Christ, conjoined with true contrition, is divinely imputed in lieu both of a missing sacrament and of the explicit desire for it. In other words, he who means to obey

Christ does obey Christ, virtually, though not expressly. Rome herself has become alarmed, and has encouraged the American bishops to warn their clergy that they incur a suspension from all sacerdotal functions by rebaptizing a Protestant absolutely whom it would have sufficed to rebaptize provisionally, or by baptizing him provisionally when inquiry would have shown that his first baptism was undoubtedly valid. It is to be hoped that this warning will do some good. Yet, when a convert from Protestantism is put up to believe in some trumpety miracle or vision supposed to be given to show him that his first baptism was void, it is evident that the hateful spirit of mere sectarianism is still strong to override one of the fundamental decisions of Rome.

It is fortunate that the instinct of domination itself has come to the aid of Christian fellowship. Rome teaches explicitly that she has no authority over the unbaptized. Heathen, Jews, Moslems, Quakers, and the yet unbaptized children of Baptists and of indifferent persons are all, by her own showings outside her jurisdiction. Accordingly, as Henry C. Lea remarks, while baptized Jews in Spain were never sure of their lives from the jealousies of the Inquisition, unbaptized Jew, went about at their ease. Her right to claim the obedience of Christians she grounds solely on the fact that they are baptized in form and, it is to be presumed, baptized validly. Therefore, however doubtful in the case of individuals, she is obliged, in the interest of her own claims, to admit that the Protestant world, as a whole, is made up of baptized persons. Thus, as Cardinal Manning expresses it, speaking immediately of England, Protestant Christendom must be considered as yet included within the covenant of salvation. Theiner's contention—that by true Catholic doctrine even infants, though as yet incapable of heresy or schism or other mortal sins, must be viewed, if not baptized by Catholics, as having received the bare sacrament, not the grace of the sacrament—is, as we have seen, plainly inconsistent with Augustine's declaration and is wholly opposed to the tenor of modern Roman Catholic theology. The Jesuits, therefore, and Manning in agreement with them, have simply developed Augustine's opinion to its legitimate conclusion, in questioning whether the English people can rightly be called either heretics or schismatics, and in declaring

that a great many of them appear never to have committed a mortal sin and are, therefore, presumably the predestinated heirs of salvation. They also remark that every added generation of Protestant habit, making it harder to apprehend the claims of Rome, augments the probability of good faith and lessens the difficulties of being saved outside the visible limits of Catholicism. These concessions apply more immediately to Anglicanism, but extend in a general way to the whole body of British Protestants and, indeed, of Protestants generally. Cardinal Newman even takes the salvability of Protestants as the fulcrum of an argument against the necessity of the devotion to Mary. If it were necessary, says he, how then could Protestants be saved? The eminent Jesuit Elizalde's powerfully logical work (from the elder point of view) was very ungraciously received by his order and has utterly failed to check this milder way of regarding Protestant nations.

The first step, therefore, toward admitting the salvability of heretics was the admission that heretical baptism, rightly administered—that is, with natural water actually flowing on the face and applied in the name of the Trinity—is valid, however ignorantly or unbelievingly performed, if only there has been an intention “to administer the rite known among Christians by the name of baptism.” The second great step was the admission that schismatics by inheritance are not necessarily schismatics or heretics in God's view. The next, coming centuries later, was the establishment of the baptism of desire. All things working toward charity work very slowly. There seems a providential necessity in this, especially in the development of the Christian Church. We know by constant observation that charity is apt to be more or less latitudinarian, and a vigorous grasp on principles more or less intolerant. Now, at the time of Christ the world was full of religions that have utterly failed to approve themselves as capable of becoming universal. The most splendid of all, the Græco-Roman, spoke for all the rest in surrendering its remnant of vital force to the Church. Buddhism has never been able to establish, at most, a higher title for its founder than that of the “light of Asia,” meaning, in fact, eastern Asia, where he has, moreover, to divide his prerogatives with three or four other systems. Brahmanism is by its very essence, incapable of existing beyond the sacred soil of India.



Zoroastrianism has declined to a glimmering spark. The rising Church was, therefore, right in recognizing herself as the sole vehicle of communication with God, the only community capable of bringing all mankind into a temporal and eternal fellowship with him and with one another. So long, therefore, as her destiny was not assured, any amount of exclusiveness was better than a flabby good nature toward systems that were only cumbering the ground. It was through her uncompromising firmness in maintaining that only within her own limits could a man be brought into union with God, here and hereafter, that she was saved from disintegration and assured of her final victory. Even in our time Christianity and Christian civilization would be dissolved if the disposition of some Christians were to prevail and all men were to be treated as standing within about the same range of spiritual opportunities, allowing to Christians merely a somewhat more eminent measure of these. All through these ages, however, charitable presumptions have not been lacking, and have seldom or never given umbrage to the Catholic Church. As a Jesuit missionary in Japan said to the Rev. Edward A. Lawrence, "The Church must have her formularies; but God is very much kinder than the Church." It has sufficed for the instinct of self-maintenance that the general and public formula has been, *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. This has had a more or less rigorous application from man to man, from country to country, from age to age. It has surely not been an evil thing that it was, on the whole, interpreted most severely in the Middle Ages; for then, between barbarism on the north and east, advancing Islam on the south and southeast, and fundamental heresy in the center, the Christian Church and order of society seemed in danger of vanishing clean out of the earth.

It is time that we should disentangle our minds of fallacious associations engendered in an uncritical time and in the heat of conflict. It is very bad logic to say, "Rome calls us and the Albigenses both heretics; therefore, we both represent one cause." We do nothing of the kind. Scholarship is now unanimous in showing that, with the exception of the Waldenses, and, perhaps, one or two evanescent circles besides, the swarming sects of the Middle Ages before the Great Schism—Albigenses, Bogomiles, Bulgarian heretics, Cathari, or whatever they might be called—were dualists, utterly denying that the world was



created by the supreme God, holding it incurably evil, and teaching that there is no certainty of salvation except in reducing the contact with matter and all ethical activities of society to their lowest terms, and that, therefore, suicide is an eminent Christian virtue. The Church, therefore, was simply maintaining the immutable principles of Christian doctrine and morals by the uncompromising severity of her judgment against all these heresies. It is remarked by Paul Sabatier, in his *Life of St. Francis of Assisi*:

Some of these movements were for great and sacred causes; but we must not let our sympathies be so moved by the persecutions suffered by heretics as to cloud our judgment. It would have been better had Rome triumphed by gentleness, by education and holiness; but, unhappily, a soldier may not always choose his weapons, and when life is at stake he seizes the first he finds within his reach. The papacy has not always been reactionary and obscurantist; when it overthrew the Cathari, for example, its victory was that of reason and good sense.

Even the Waldenses were tainted with this dualism; and their properly Christian wing, even in those cruel times, was instinctively recognized by the Catholic priesthood as its auxiliary in the contest with the Cathari. As Archbishop Trench remarks, the Waldenses alone, of all the multitudinous sects of the Middle Ages, survived persecution, because they alone deserved to survive.

After the reconciliation of the Great Schism, which was purely a question of papal title, and in which it is acknowledged that men and women of equal sanctity and soundness are found on either side, there remained only three notable heresies—two originating during the schism—the Waldenses, the Lollards, and the Hussites. The Waldenses were hardly regarded as fully heretical. The Council of Basel even ordained two bishops for them. The Lollards were nearly extinct. The Hussites, in their prevailing Utraquist form, were finally reconciled to the Church, as a body peculiarly privileged and, as I judge, without being required to accept the condemnation of Huss. Indeed, even now there are Catholic churches of Bohemia in which his picture hangs up as that of a saint. The Taborite wing, putting off their warlike fierceness, issued in the elder Moravian Church and attracted little attention outside of their own country. Heresy and schism having, therefore, for a while

almost disappeared, it is probable that the abstract question, Can schismatics and heretics be saved? was but little agitated.

It is probably a memorial of this more tranquil frame of mind, not yet disturbed by the rising commotions in Germany, that we possess in a theological treatise, published at Milan in 1520, on the nature of justifying faith. I have never seen it and do not recall the name of the author; but his position appears to be about this: The faith that justifies must always and everywhere have been the same thing—namely, an entire and self-surrendering confidence in the righteous goodness of God. Whatever state of ignorance, therefore, still leaves motives that induce such a confidence is consistent with the salvation of those who live under it. The dissertation appears to have given no offense, nor, indeed, to have received much notice of any kind, although it is possible that it may have helped to develop the views of which the Jesuits ultimately became the chief representatives.

Now came the mighty schism of the Reformation, which, to the Catholic consciousness, appeared as a breaking loose of all the forces of hell. For eighty years the defection spread more and more widely. Until the year 1600, therefore, it still appeared to Catholics as a fresh movement to be conscientiously repressed. By that time, however, a great part of the Protestants were such by an inheritance of several generations; yet to the Catholic mind the character of personal complicity in heresy and schism was reflected upon them from their fresher confederates, and the question of salvability, whenever raised, was promptly answered in the negative. The continental Protestants, on the other hand, Lutherans and even Calvinists, appear to have commonly agreed with Luther that "many and mighty saints have remained under the pope." But in Britain they were less tolerant. Knox and the Presbyterians were thrown into convulsions of anger at a timid suggestion that, perhaps, an occasional child of God might be found even among the papists. Richard Hooker very nearly fell into disgrace by suggesting that, at least before the Reformation, some of their ancestors might, perhaps, have been saved. He made his peace, however, by modifying his thesis to this effect—that, at least, there was more hope for them than for the Lutherans. The Catholics roared out, "Burn the Protestant heretics!" The Protestants

bellowed back, "Cut down the popish idolaters!" The Jesuit Mariana applauded the assassin of Henry III of France. Theodore Beza applauded the assassin of the Duke of Guise. Philip Melancthon prayed that God would raise up an assassin to cut down Henry VIII of England. John Knox pronounced the murder of David Rizzio a godly deed. Reason and conscience, manners and morals, and, above all, primal humanity, appeared on the point of all going to wreck together. At last the tide of Protestant advance was stayed, and Rome, by fair means and foul, even recovered half of wasted Germany. The peace of Westphalia, signed in 1648, assured the desolated world that the hour of international religious aggressions was past. The treaty was celebrated by the Capuchins from the pulpits of Vienna as a noble and holy work, and received by the Jesuits with deep disgust.

Yet, curiously enough, it was the Jesuits, rather than the Capuchins, who soon became the champions of opinions which represented it as a matter of comparatively little consequence whether a man were Catholic or Protestant. Dr. Theiner notices, though with evident disrelish, the fact that, from about 1650 or 1670, a good many of the Jesuits have championed the salvability of Protestants. This fact unquestionably runs sadly athwart his purpose of demonstrating that Roman Catholicism denies this, for the Jesuits were then commonly regarded in theology, as in everything else, as being the very flower of Catholicism. Pascal had already dealt his deadly blow; but its withering force was not yet fully disclosed. It is true that the Holy See soon began to condemn a great many moral propositions of the Jesuit writers, but, I believe, not one doctrinal proposition, certainly not one bearing favorably on the salvation of Protestants.\* Dr. Theiner, therefore, finds himself in some embarrassment. He is fain to resort to his favorite weapon, and hurls against the Jesuits a charge of hypocrisy. Their doctrine of probabilism, he declares, and with good warrant, allows them to teach almost anything that they like; and, therefore, where they find their account in it they teach that Protestants may be saved, and, where they do not, that they will surely be damned.

Undoubtedly the Jesuits have, times innumerable, varied their

\*Subsequent reading shows me one such condemnation. See footnote on p. 734.

teachings according to their interests. No society has ever existed that exemplified so many forms of simulation and dissimulation, practical and theoretical. There can be no doubt, however, that as a whole they have been immovably, even fanatically, devoted to the doctrine of probabilism and have stood unflinchingly for it, even when it made against them. Partisanship here has been too strong for policy, as it has many a time been in the history of the order. It was not in the interest of any negotiation with Protestants that a French Jesuit of the seventeenth century contended that a Protestant who holds his own religion probable, but Catholicism more probable, is excused from turning Catholic till he comes to die; and it was not to please the Huguenots, but to drive their associate into greater self-consistency, that his brethren declared that such a Protestant does not prejudice his salvation by dying, as well as living, in his own religion.\* Indeed, so far as the Jesuits dissembled at all, they seem rather to have dissembled the other way. Thus, the French Jesuit, mentioned by Döllinger and Reusch, who had been a missionary in England does not appear to have used any such indulgent formulas there; but on returning to France he assures his fellow Catholics, as I have mentioned, that great numbers of the English, though zealous Protestants, are really neither heretics nor schismatics, and declares that, of the many converts he and other priests had received, a large number were still in a state of baptismal grace and, of course, needed no absolution, but, even had they died in the Church of England, would infallibly have been saved.

But this is a little thing compared with what we find from their private correspondence, much of which was seized and published at the dissolution of the order. This correspondence gives their ideas as expressed among themselves. Thus, we find Father La Quintinye writing in 1666 from France to Oliva, the general of the order, at Rome, complaining bitterly of the length to which his brethren went in their indulgent presumptions regarding the heretics. It might, he intimates, perhaps be endured that a charitable hope should be held out to the lay heretic in an heretical country, visited but dimly by the light of Catholic truth; but his brethren, he declares, in their private conferences were not content with this. They insisted that it

\* This assertion had been condemned by Innocent XI.

was possible and, indeed, was of actual occurrence that Protestants brought up in France itself, surrounded from infancy by the bright light of Catholic faith, might yet grow up justified children of God. Even here, says he (I give the substance, not the words), we can imagine a layman so ignorant and simple, and sometimes so shut up in heretical companionship, that such a presumption, by a violent stretch of charity, might be suffered to pass. But my Jesuit brethren think even this a little thing. They affirm that even a Calvinistic minister, and one of eminent parts, of wide reading, and much experience of controversy, may, in Catholic France, occupy "the chair of pestilence" for many years without ever losing baptismal grace, so that, if at last by God's favor he comes into the true Church, his confessor cannot absolve him, because, having heard from him a confession of his whole life, he can find nothing in him to absolve. To this bitter complaint of the worthy La Quintinye, along with many much better-grounded complaints, Oliva dryly replies that he has heard how intractable he is among his brethren, and expects him to be of one mind with them, but, if not, at least to keep his dissentient opinions to himself.

Here we find that the theory of hypocrisy will not work at all. In the first place, this good opinion of Protestant sanctity does not rest on the doubtful and exceptionable doctrine of probabilism, but on the undoubted and unexceptionable doctrine of invincible ignorance. Next, we find that it becomes more emphatic in proportion as it is more completely secluded within the inner circles of Jesuitism itself. The Jesuits, we see, extol possible and actual Protestant piety much more unreservedly where no Protestant can hear. And it is not they that have disclosed this to us, but their enemies. Next, we find that the head of the order, an Italian, not a Frenchman, living in Rome itself, not in Paris, finds this way of thinking entirely unexceptionable and scolds his subordinate for not being willing to share it. In like manner, when the Jansenist cardinal Le Camus requested the Jesuits in his diocese of Grenoble to aid him in working for the conversion of Protestants, they excused themselves with the careless remark, "*Quand on croira en Jésus-Christ, on se sauve partout*"—"If one only believes in Jesus Christ he will be saved in any Church."

If, then, we must, as good Protestants, accuse the Jesuits of dissembling in this matter, it is plain that we shall have to reverse Dr. Theiner's indictment, and accuse them of concealing from the Protestants the high hopes which they really cherished of their salvation. This accusation, too, would be unjust, but less glaringly so than the other. In truth, the Jesuits made no special mystery of their opinions, either in France or in Italy. When they were accused to the Inquisition at Naples of teaching that many heretics, and even many heathen, would probably be saved, they appear to have taken no pains to reply, and the Inquisition no pains to investigate. A Jesuit at Antwerp, being appointed to attend a Protestant soldier condemned to be shot for some breach of discipline, required of him no retractation of Protestantism, but simply assisted him to recite various prayers expressive of faith and love, read aloud to him the seventeenth chapter of John, and after his death solicited the prayers of the faithful for him as presumably one of the holy souls in purgatory. This gave great scandal to the Jansenists, but seems to have been wholly acceptable to the Jesuits.

The pious and illustrious Innocent XI highly appreciated the noble qualities of Jansenism and cordially disliked the Jesuits, many of whose moral propositions he condemned; and he even contemplated abolishing the order, as Clement XIV actually did. He probably shared the sterner views of his Jansenist friends as to the difficulty of being saved out of the visible communion with Rome. Yet he appears never to have raised any objection to the Jesuit teachings in this direction.\* Nor does the heroic Jesuit general Gonzalez, who really fell a martyr to the stress of his efforts to uproot probabilism, appear to have tried to debar his brethren of their liberty to a large presumption of charity in favor of the salvation of heretics. Thus encouraged, the Jesuits, in 1713, induced the Church to take the first formal step toward pronouncing that heretics may be saved. They slipped into the list of the one hundred and one condemnations found in the odious constitution *Unigenitus* a condemnation of this proposition: "Grace is not given out of the Church." This, though little noticed at the time, was really the beginning of an essentially new attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward Christians standing aloof from her,

\* With the one exception noted above.



and ultimately toward mankind at large. The best thing that could be done for Clement XI would be to forget the odiousness of the rest of the *Unigenitus* and to remember that he condemned the proposition that grace is not given out of the Church.

It was a good while before the full effects of this new position of Rome were apprehended, although it was not so much a reversal, as a more explicit development, of earlier teachings. Prosper Lambertini, afterward the eminent Benedict XIV, held that God, in the order of nature, may develop virtues in the heathen which shall essentially affect their future condition for good, but will not suffice to bring them to the beatific vision. For a long while many, even of the Jesuits themselves, would not go so far as to say that the grace of final salvation was granted out of the Church. Archbishop Carroll, who had been a Jesuit, had a pretty keen controversy with a fellow Jesuit who still insisted against Carroll that visible communion with Rome is always necessary to salvation. Even lately, the Paulist Alfred Young has found it necessary, in controversy with a New York Redemptorist, to contend for the Catholic proposition, "A Protestant is capable of making an act of saving faith." The late Dr. Schaff, however, appears to stop short of the actually prevailing interpretation of the clause of the *Unigenitus* above quoted, explaining it as meaning that grace may be given out of the Church, but not the grace of salvation. That was hardly the position, even of Benedict XIV, as applied to the dissentient Christians, and very certainly is not the present position of the papacy, as I shall presently show. The Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes, who was for several years a Roman Catholic, remarks that it is contrary to the mind of Rome to make any restriction, reservation, or explanation whatever of her affirmation that grace may be given out of the Church. To say, then, that the grace of regeneration may be given, but not the grace of sanctification, or the grace for sanctification, but not the grace of final perseverance, appears to be a distinct evasion of the position of Clement XI. Moreover, it contradicts the fundamental doctrine of the Roman Church, which, like every Christian Church worthy the name, teaches that God never bestows a grace except with the purpose of making it, unless frustrated by the perverseness of men, introductory to a greater grace, and so on to perfection.



Clement XI negatively pronounced for salvability out of the Church. But Pius IX, as remarked by Cardinal Newman, appears to be the first pope who publicly and officially proclaimed the salvability of heretics in its positive form. His encyclical to the bishops of Italy, dated August 10, 1863, declares:

We and you know that those who lie under invincible ignorance as regards our most holy religion and who, diligently observing the natural law and its precepts which are engraven by God on the hearts of all, and, prepared to obey God, lead a good and upright life, are able, by the operation of the power of divine light and grace, to obtain eternal life.

In an earlier allocution Pius instructed the faithful that prejudice against Catholicism, in a pious and upright man, is not necessarily to be imputed as sinfulness. How easy it is, he observes, to come early under an invincible bias of education which will never permit a man, however honest, to apprehend the Catholic religion in its true light! It will be observed that this official declaration of Pius IX goes much farther than to pronounce heretics salvable. It evidently applies also to Jews, Moslems, and pagans if they be pure in mind, lovers of truth, and lovers of God. And this is now undoubtedly the prevailing opinion in the Roman Catholic Church, being a point as to which the Jesuits and their enemies are entirely agreed, as Dr. Döllinger remarks. The Jesuits, however, appear to be content to let the papal declarations work gradually and to tolerate members, even in their own body, who refuse as yet to receive their full force.

Some one has expressed wonder that Pius IX should be quoted in favor of the salvability of heretics when he is known to have been so hostile to liberal Catholicism. But there his words are, explicit, authentic, official, authoritative. Nor is there any difficulty in the case. Who have been the great enemies of liberal Catholicism? The Jesuits. And who have been the great champions of the salvability of heretics? Again, the Jesuits. There is not the least inconsistency in this. Because a man believes that many heretics, and even many heathen, will probably be saved, there is no reason why he may not be hostile to civil progress, to education, to religious liberty, to the independence of the State, to all other Churches than his own. God, he might say, may save many souls, notwithstanding these evil things; how many more, then, if the evil could be

entirely swept away? The Jansenists were much more the friends of enlightenment and of civil progress than the Jesuits; yet they confined the elect strictly within the visible limits of the Catholic Church. Pius IX was too benevolent a man not to have large hopes of the saving mercies of God; but he was too narrow-minded a man to reconcile himself with the modern age. He cordially detested its abounding evils, and hardly less cordially its new forms of higher good. As remarked by Dr. Roswell D. Hitchcock, his famous encyclical and syllabus are curiously divided, about half and half, between condemnations of flagrant evils, and of precious benefits, of modern civilization.

In what way can the old formula, "Out of the Church no salvation," be reconciled with the new formula, "A devout heretic may be saved?" There seem to be two ways. One is to use the word "Protestant" in two senses. Protestantism, to Catholic apprehension, means the spirit of rebellion against the legitimate authority of the Church. A genuine Protestant, therefore, cannot be saved. Or "Protestant" simply means one who is devoted to his ancestral religion, not because of its rebelliousness, but because of its Christianity. Such a one is, in the view of God, simply a Roman Catholic Christian unhappily circumstanced. No one can be saved unless he follows the Roman Catholic religion; but he may, by invincible error, call by a hostile name that which the divine judgment accepts as true Catholic piety. He will not, it is held, be saved simply by good faith in his heresy. There must be added to this actual faith and love. Therefore, one catechism might teach that a Protestant can be saved, and another that he cannot be, without any contradiction between them. These distinctions, as we know, are familiar even to illiterate Catholics. Thus, when Bishop Wilberforce's Irish coachman declared that his lordship would be saved "on account of his inconsavable ignorance," he showed that he had been well taught in his religion, although he was somewhat more severe in his choice of an adjective than he intended to be. Thus, also, when Cardinal Gibbons declares that whoever is not with the pope is not with Christ, his meaning, as the *Independent* well says, is by no means so truculent as his words. His book, *The Faith of our Fathers*, unequivocally acknowledges as a justified Christian everyone who receives the evangelical message with faith

and love, however ignorant of Christ's full will. The more direct way is to distinguish between the soul of the Church and her body. Thus, the highly authoritative catechism of the Jesuit Deharbe says, "Such as are heretics without their own fault, but sincerely search after the truth, and in the meantime do the will of God to the best of their knowledge, although they are separated from the body, remain, however, united to the soul of the Church and partake of her graces;" though, of course, they are regarded as suffering many grievous spiritual privations.

Of course, the presumption as to the greater or less number of God's elect children outside the visible limits of the Catholic Church will be greater or less from man to man, according to temper or the measure of familiarity with Protestants. No doubt there are whole regions of the Church where Protestants are practically regarded as, one and all, children of perdition. Indeed, Orestes A. Brownson, complaining of Lady Georgiana Fullerton, that in her stories she assumes all religious Protestants to be virtually Catholics, insists that every particular Protestant ought always to be regarded as out of a state of salvation. He may indeed, says Brownson, be known to God as a member of the Catholic Church; but this ought never to be assumed. The prevailing tone of feeling in instructed Catholic circles seems to be between these extremes, but decidedly and increasingly inclining rather to Lady Georgiana than to Orestes A. Brownson.

*Charles C. Starbuck*

ART. V.—JOHN WOOLMAN AND STEPHEN GIRARD—  
A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE BIOGRAPHY.

IN the year 1681, sixty-one years after the landing of the Pilgrims and seven years prior to the English Revolution, a deputy surveyor of the province of West New Jersey, North America, made to the council of proprietors a report containing this statement: "Surveyed one parcel of land abutting on Rancocas Creek, within which tract of land is a mountain, to which the province, east, west, south, and north, sends a beautiful aspect, named by the owner thereof Mount Holly." At the base of this "mountain," which, in fact, is only a modest hill two hundred feet high, and on the banks of the Rancocas there arose in due time a town, to which was also given the name of Mount Holly. The history of the place during a period of two hundred years, from the days of its life as "a good-sized hamlet" in 1750, through the French and Indian War, the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the Rebellion, to this last decade of the nineteenth century, in which it reports itself as a "thriving city of sixty-five hundred inhabitants," would, no doubt, prove of interest. But it is not of Mount Holly itself that I write, though the theme is attractive. I write of two men whose names appear in the category of the world's distinguished philanthropists, one of whom was born in or near the village, and the other of whom resided there for a year during the British supremacy in Philadelphia—John Woolman, tailor, nurseryman, Quaker preacher, social reformer; and Stephen Girard, mariner, merchant, millionaire. Each of these transacted business in the streets of Mount Holly.

Almost all memorial of Woolman has disappeared. The "small, plain, two-story structure, with two windows in each story in front," was long ago destroyed. The store in which he began his career as an antislavery agitator has been either removed or remodeled, so that its identity has been lost. No portrait of him was ever painted, no statue ever carved. There are no monuments to his memory, no institutions whose existence is due to his foresight or wealth. And yet John G. Whittier says, "A far-reaching moral, social, and political revolution, undoing the evil work of centuries, unquestionably

owes much of its original impulse to the life and labors of a poor, unlearned workingman of New Jersey, whose very existence was scarcely known beyond the narrow circle of his religious society." In language of sweet simplicity and beautiful *naïveté* he wrote a *Journal* and, dying in the city of York, England, bequeathed it to the sect with which his ministry had been identified. He did not know that in the inventory of the world's spiritual and literary resources it would be classed among the most valuable of its assets. Mount Holly loyally regards John Woolman as her greatest citizen, the one worthiest of reverence.

Stephen Girard, contemporary of Woolman for more than twenty-two years, is a far more familiar figure in the history of the United States and of Christendom. Of Girard there are memorials, unique and splendid; and in Mount Holly the house in which he lived may still be pointed out, and his store, though incorporated in a larger building, is yet identifiable. Portraits have been engraved, a statue has been erected, and in Philadelphia there stands, unsurpassed among modern reproductions of Greek architecture, the Girard College for Orphans. For half a century this institution has fulfilled its high purpose of educating boys—for this life. Thither thousands of visitors go every year to see its splendid buildings, its beautiful grounds, and the beneficiaries of the colossal bequest of the French cabin boy who, poor, uneducated, almost friendless, sailed away from Bordeaux to the West Indies and died an honored citizen of the United States, a multi-millionaire at a time when millionaires were few.

It were easy to debate the question, "Who was the world's greater benefactor, John Woolman or Stephen Girard?" and good argument may be adduced to prove that the banker whose loans—at interest—saved the credit, if not the very life, of the United States in 1814, whose immense contributions to the city treasury of Philadelphia made many great public improvements possible, whose gifts to charitable institutions and churches sustained their life during critical emergencies, and whose beneficence created a great institution for the benefit of orphaned boys was a greater philanthropist, a nobler benefactor, a truer friend of humanity than a mere Quaker preacher, by trade a tailor, whose vocation was only that of a traveling evangelist in a minor religious sect, bearing his testimony against

slavery and other social evils and writing a few pamphlets and a journal of a few score pages. Judged by manifest achievement, the products of Girard's philanthropy are far beyond those of Woolman's. But, whatever the merit due to deeds of charity, whatever the place of almsgiving in the economy of personal salvation, and whatever the degree of honor and admiration to be ascribed to him who gives or bequeaths the harvest of his successful ventures in business to his fellow-mortals in need, I am confident that there are such distinctions in the spirit in which philanthropists render service, such inherent differences in quality of character, that one who does less than another may be far greater and more fully realize the ideals of life than he whose gifts are known in all the crowded streets and glorified through all the passing centuries. Though Woolman's name is overshadowed by that of Girard, it stands for a better type of manhood, a more genial spirit of life, a sweeter heart, a truer solution of the complex problem of existence. And so in this study of comparative biography, gauging Girard's life according to the standard of Woolman's character and conduct, I pronounce Woolman to be the better man, and his life, considered in itself, a better life—better in its impulses and ideals, better in its immediate and ultimate relations and results.

Without attempting an analysis of the facts of heredity—that push under the effect of which life is begun, if not carried on, in this world—there are facts of ancestry which ought to be studied in comparing any two men and pronouncing equitable judgment upon their careers. Woolman's life was begun under the influence of parents who fulfilled the duties of their relation. Perhaps the boy was prematurely, certainly precociously, pious. At seven years of age he was acquainted, as he says, "with the operations of divine love." He remembered leaving the society of his schoolmates to read a chapter from his New Testament. On "first days," after the meeting, his parents used frequently to "set" him to read the Bible or other religious books. Still, he was a boy, and on at least one occasion was borne away by the stone-throwing instincts that characterize the "savage period" through which most boys pass in the evolution of normal manhood, and was guilty of killing a mother robin. Smitten with remorse and wishing to obviate all ill consequence to the young birds in the nest, he promptly annihilated the whole

brood. He was once disrespectful in speech to his mother. He even drifted or was drawn into "wanton company," and, though never guilty of serious sin, became indifferent to the requirements of a Christian life and bade fair—or foul—to become as giddy as any of the young folks who lived in Mount Holly in the early years of the eighteenth century. But he was not satisfied with the "mirth and wantonness" of this society, and before he had attained his majority had begun that positive religious life which afterward became more and more intense until the end.

Girard was born in France in 1750, of parents who seem to have discriminated against him, denying him the opportunities of education granted to their other children. Losing in boyhood the sight of his right eye, he became bitter and cynical under his misfortunes and shipped to the West Indies as a cabin boy. Returning home, he was so frigidly received that he sailed away and never again saw France. Locating in Philadelphia in 1769—the same year in which Woolman's mind was being "exercised" for his fellow-creatures in the West Indies and disturbed by recollections of having sold rum, sugar, and molasses in the store at Mount Holly—Girard established himself in business on Water street, but made, also, several voyages between the West Indies, New York, and Philadelphia. At the beginning of the Revolution he opened a grocery and cider-bottling establishment. Having no compunctions of conscience in regard to the sale of intoxicating drinks, he further engaged in the liquor traffic, making large profits on contracts with the Continental army. In 1780 he resumed trade with the Indies, and in 1782 leased a range of stores which, to his own advantage, he sublet. Here is a man with Midas's fingers; everything becomes gold. All winds waft him on to wealth.

So, too, Woolman seems a favorite of the god of riches. He "had begun with selling trimmings for garments, and from thence proceeded to sell cloths and linens." His trade increased year by year, thrifty Quaker that he was, among Quakers who were loyal to a brother in business. But Woolman says:

I felt a stop in my mind. . . . The increase of business became my burden; for, though my natural inclination was toward merchandise, yet I believed that truth required me to live more free from outward cumbers,



and there was now a strife in my mind between the two. Then I lessened my outward business and as I had opportunity told my customers of my intentions, that they might consider what shop to turn to; and in a while I wholly laid down my merchandise and followed my trade as a tailor by myself, having no apprentice.

Woolman did not condemn the mercantile life in itself. He admitted that it might be free from secularizing effect if lived in a pure spirit; but for himself it had become inconsistent with that ideal which he had gradually formed. He wished to read, to think, to meet men in their homes and "meeting houses," to discuss high themes of duty, to bear free testimony against social evils, and to extirpate them in a spirit of fearlessness and charity. Deliberately, therefore, he withdrew from business and limited himself to his handicraft and to collateral occupations as a scrivener and gardener.

Girard could neither imitate such an act nor understand the ethical impulses that prompted it. Perhaps it was not necessary that he should imitate it; perhaps it was his vocation to buy and sell, as it was that of Samuel Budgett, of Bristol, England. But it was essential to Woolman's peace of mind and joy of heart that he should cherish a higher purpose than that of mercantile life for its own sake or as a means of excluding thought of other duty and other pleasure. He resolved to be master of his own life work, while Girard resolved to intoxicate himself with labor. Woolman said: "To labor hard, or cause others to do so, that we may live conformably to customs which Christ, our Redeemer, discountenanced by his example in the days of his flesh and which are contrary to divine order, is to manure a soil for propagating an evil seed in the earth." Girard said: "I work like a galley slave. I have no higher ambition than to labor. When I rise in the morning my only effort is to labor so hard during the day that when the night comes I may be enabled to sleep soundly." Contrasted with the serene life of Woolman, the life of Girard was a mistake and a failure, because Girard willfully refused to accept the methods instituted by God for the perfecting of heart and mind. As in his business life, so in his home life, Girard excluded God. For many years his wife was insane. He attempted to conceal the fact; but people talked, and Girard was compelled to commit her to an asylum. There a babe was

born and died. At last the mother and wife sank into the grave, and Girard, disciple of Voltaire and Rousseau, stumbled on into the starless night of skepticism bitterer than ever.

Woolman's family life was unshadowed, unless by his own long absences on his journeys, or those periods of depression when he was waiting for his "voices" to summon him forth on his mission against slavery. For that was his especial mission—to testify against slavery. He had known no other society than that of which negro slavery was an element; but his moral instincts led him aright, and on a memorable occasion in the shop at Mount Holly he uttered his first modest protest against traffic in human life. He writes:

My employer, having a negro woman, sold her and desired me to write a bill of sale, the man being waiting who bought her. The thing was sudden; and, though I felt uneasy at the thoughts of writing an instrument of slavery for one of my fellow-creatures, yet I remembered that I was hired by the year, that it was my master who directed me to do it, and that it was an elderly man, a member of our society, who bought her. So, through weakness, I gave way and wrote it; but at the executing of it I was so afflicted in my mind that I said, before my master and the Friend, that I believed slave-keeping to be a practice inconsistent with the Christian religion.

This was in 1742. Woolman was then only twenty-two years old. Whittier says that this event, "simple and inconsiderable in itself, was made the instrumentality of exerting a mighty influence upon slavery in the Society of Friends." It was the beginning of a unique career of agitation, so different from that of later abolitionists that its methods of disseminating unpopular opinions and creating a public sentiment in their favor are well worth study and imitation. Of course, slavery was not then the powerful institution that it subsequently became; but Woolman pronounced it wrong and accepted the task of testifying against it in public and in private, in the meeting house and in the mansion. In the parlors and dining rooms of the planters themselves he quietly uttered his protest against slave labor. Referring to one of his itineraries among the "meetings," he says:

My mind was deeply engaged in this visit, both in public and private; and at several places where I was, on observing that they had slaves, I found myself under a necessity, in a friendly way, to labor with them on

that subject, expressing, as way opened, the inconsistency of that practice with the purity of the Christian religion and the ill effects of it manifested amongst us.

"In a friendly way"—that was the key to his method. He acquired the art of antagonizing evils without exciting hostility. He was neither ostracized nor mobbed, though never a popular person.

Girard did not consider it his vocation to denounce the evils of the social system—much less to refuse to profit by the unrequited slave labor of the West Indian islands or of the slave colonies and slave States. He was not as scrupulously honest as Woolman. It is definitely alleged that he would not pay a debt if it were possible to avoid it. He was not ashamed to repudiate it if repudiation could be technically justified in the name of "law." In contrast with such a spirit is the scrupulous integrity of the "eccentric" Woolman, as exhibited in a transaction of which he makes the following record in his *Journal*:

As persons setting negroes free in our province are bound by law to maintain them in case they have need of relief, some in the time of my youth, who scrupled to keep slaves for [the whole] term of life, were wont to detain their young negroes in their service without wages till they were thirty years of age. With this custom I so far agreed that, being joined with another Friend in executing the will of a deceased Friend, I once sold a negro lad till he might attain the age of thirty years and applied the money to the use of the estate. With abasement of heart I may now say that sometimes, as I have sat in a meeting with my heart exercised toward that awful Being who respecteth not persons nor colors and have thought upon this lad, I have felt that all was not clear in my mind concerning him; and, as I have attended to this exercise and fervently sought the Lord, it hath appeared to me that I should make some restitution. . . . I executed a bond binding myself and my executors to pay to the man to whom he was sold what, to candid men, might appear equitable for the last four and a half years of his time, in case the said youth should be living and in a condition likely to provide comfortably for himself.

Girard and others would pronounce this an eccentricity or extreme of virtue. But in this eccentricity of virtue lay the merit of Woolman's conduct. I am told by some that he was unbalanced—a moral monomaniac! But of such is the kingdom of God.

In deciding upon his behavior he was sometimes in long-continued perplexity, and his conclusions were reached only

after the most careful deliberation and earnest prayer; but in one instance his mind was influenced and his decision determined by a dream, or vision. He writes :

I was brought so near the gates of death that I forgot my name. Being then desirous to know who I was, I saw a mass of matter of a dull, gloomy color between the south and the east, and was informed that this mass was human beings in as great misery as they could be and live, and that I was mixed with them, and that henceforth I might not consider myself as a distinct or separate being. In this state I remained several hours. I then heard a soft, melodious voice, more pure and harmonious than any I had heard with my ears before. I believed it was the voice of an angel who spake to the other angels; the words were, "John Woolman is dead!" I soon remembered that I was once John Woolman, and, being assured that I was alive in the body, I greatly wondered what that heavenly voice could mean. . . . I was then carried in spirit to the mines, where poor, oppressed people were digging rich treasures for those called Christians, and heard them blaspheme the name of Christ, at which I was grieved, for his name to me was precious.

Recovering his health of body and emerging from this state of trance—akin to that exaltation to paradise of which St. Paul writes—he saw, as he says, that the use of silver vessels was stained with pride and that he should not conform to those social customs which required their presence upon the table. With all this conscientiousness and accumulation of scruples, he must have been an unwelcome guest had he not possessed the charm of an unusual humility. He did not regard himself an authoritative censor of morals and manners—only a man who aspired to a scrupulous and unspotted purity. He did not shrink, however, from the hard task of arraigning evildoers. Lotteries, luxuries, foolish fashions of dress, the traffic in intoxicating drinks, theatrical performances, the money mania—all these he antagonized, not with the fierceness and theatricality of his contemporary, Benjamin Lay, but with impressive mingling of gentleness of manner and positiveness of conviction.

At last, after a tour among Indian tribes in this country, he felt moved to visit England. For four months he exercised his ministry in the places sanctified by memories of the founders of Quakerism, and, having reached York, fell ill. During his sickness he uttered these words of communing with God :

O Lord, my God! the amazing horrors of darkness were gathered around me and covered me all over, and I saw no way to go forth. I felt the

depth and extent of the misery of my fellow-creatures separated from the divine harmony, and it was heavier than I could bear, and I was crushed under it. I lifted up my hand, I stretched out my arm, but there was none to help me; I looked round about and was amazed. In the depths of my misery, O Lord, I remembered that thou art omnipotent, that I had called thee Father, and I felt that I loved thee, and I was made quiet in my will, and I waited for deliverance from thee. Thou hadst pity upon me when no man could help me. I saw that meekness under suffering was showed to us in the most affecting example of thy Son, and thou taught me to follow him, and I said, "Thy will, O Father, be done!"

And so the will of the Father was done; he entered into the larger life October 5, 1772.

To Stephen Girard, as to Woolman, the end—or the beginning—came at last. He had toiled on through a tortuous course of harassing public and private affairs, had held to his oars like a wretched galley slave, was worn out with ceaseless cares, exhausted of nerve force until he succumbed to insomnia, disgusted even with money-making, anxious only to occupy himself with business. There were rifts in the clouds, and an occasional gleam of optimism shot through the rifts. He served his city well during the dreadful days of the plague, flinging himself into danger without fear and, perhaps, with the secret wish that death might come and end his impoverished life. He died; and the Quaker City decreed him a public funeral. Over the dust of the French infidel, the miser, the inhospitable cynic, rises his monument—the majestic college. The story of his life, whatever its value, has no inspiration for the two-worldly or other-worldly man—for him who would attain the true peace and completeness of living. To write Woolman's *Journal* and live Woolman's life would be greater honor than to gather millions of money at the price of peace and of fellowship with the best men of the ages.

On Thursday, August 16, 1894, as I rode through the streets of Mount Holly, the door of the old Friends' meeting house, built in 1775, stood open. It was "fifth day," and meeting was to be held. Before noon of that day I stood at the gates of Girard College, and was given a card containing an extract from the will of Stephen Girard prohibiting the admission of any "ecclesiastic, missionary, or minister of any sect whatsoever, . . . for any purpose, or as a visitor." Because the hands of William T. Harris and Stephen M. Merrill had once been im-

posed upon my head in ordination I was not permitted to pass the lodge. Had I sat in the lowly brick meeting house, unadorned and obscure, I would have been in fellowship with the spirits of just men made perfect and with the Spirit of God. Had I entered the halls of Girard College I should have been impressed by majesty of architecture and grandeur of wealth; but, beyond and beneath, I would have had visions of a sorrow-smitten, pessimistic, cynical infidel. He has often been styled a philanthropist. I fancy he would sneer at the title. Woolman would decline it, too; but in his heart he loved God, and in his heart he loved all his fellow-men.

*G. M. Hammell.*

ART. VI.—SOCIAL AND ETHICAL SIGNIFICANCE  
OF INDIVIDUAL WEALTH.

Is a man really culpable of moral misdemeanor if he becomes very wealthy? In other words, is it wicked to get rich? A certain number of persons seem disposed to answer these questions in the affirmative. The theory is not a new one; but of late it has taken a more definite form and is, therefore, more influential. It is not the sole object of this paper to refute the doctrine or to convert the believers in it from the error of their ways; but, since a vague feeling prevails more or less widely that there is not only an unequal, but an unjust, distribution of wealth, it is desirable to get a clearer conception of the good and evil involved in the actual conditions. Let us examine the grounds of the conviction that large accumulations by a limited number of the members of a community, while others are only moderately provided for and still others are miserably poor, are intrinsically vicious.

The main assumption appears to be that only a certain amount of wealth can be created, and only so much as can be produced by manual labor. Even if this were so there would still be inequalities; for manual laborers differ widely in their powers of production, one man's ability in this respect being three, five, or, perhaps, ten times as great as that of another. It is true that these are usually ranked as skilled laborers; but skilled labor, in its proper sense, depends upon certain physical qualities. On the whole, they may be classed among manual workers. But the power to produce wealth in any extraordinary degree is purely psychical. It ranges all the way from moderate cleverness in adapting means to ends to consummate genius. In its general characteristics it is entirely analogous—we might say entirely similar—to powers that are exclusively intellectual. We know how widely men differ in respect of scientific, literary, and artistic abilities, and how few there are who attain to really great competence as statesmen or as military leaders. There is no reason for believing that men differ any less in those capabilities which are essential to the production of wealth. Nor is there any basis for the assumption that only a limited amount of wealth can be created by a single in-



dividual. Production is the rendering of the utilities of nature available to man. The resources of nature are practically infinite; the ability to lay hold of them is all that is needed; and there is no reason for limiting this power to anything heretofore achieved.

The psychical factors operating in the production of wealth are both more numerous and more influential than have been apprehended by the majority of even able thinkers. Leaving out for the present the added power that has come through the invention of machinery, by which production is increased from five to fifty fold, and the scientific discoveries on which these inventions rest, we may yet readily see how largely the creation of wealth is due to mere mental ability. We have instances where, by the simple organization of a force of laboring men and a skillful distribution of the work according to individual capacity, the product has been increased to more than two hundred times the previous amount, and this, too, by purely handicraft process. Clearly enough the increase in these cases was the result of superior mental, and not of manual, power. Still more remarkable is the effect of the ingenuity of man when working with machinery.

The plea is made by certain socialistic writers that, while it is true that this great increase of productive effect has its source in psychical, rather than physical, causes, it is also true that the men who possess the former are dependent on manual laborers, and, therefore, that these should be, if not equal sharers in the industrial result, at least larger sharers than they are. The general tendency of thought with the class of thinkers to whom reference is made is that there should be an equality of distribution. If by this were only meant that the amount going to the manual laborers should be equal to that going to employers it might be replied that the former do now receive not only as large an amount, but even much more. In the annual report for 1893 upon the manufactures of the State of Massachusetts by the Bureau of Statistics we find that in nine leading industries, embracing more than nineteen hundred establishments, the amount directly paid in wages was fifty-five per cent of the whole product, while that paid indirectly would make a considerable addition. In many instances it went up to sixty, and even sixty-five, per cent. But this is not accepted

as a fair equivalent by many. Some go to the extent of insisting that every laborer should receive as much as any proprietor. This would, of course, imply an equality of compensation among the laborers themselves. It would be difficult to show that ethical justice demands such a distribution. If it is to be conceded it must be either on the ground of benevolence or of industrial policy. On these topics something further will appear as we go on.

As to the principle that the mutual dependence of manual laborers and the *entrepreneur* implies the right of sharing equally in the product, it is evidently contrary to the practical judgment of man in other and analogous social relations. No one really thinks that the organ blower should receive equal credit with the man who handles the keys in a musical performance; and yet the latter is as really dependent on the former as the man of great business ability is on his workmen. The sculptor is dependent on the common quarryman and the stone hewer for the block out of which he makes his statue; but no one claims that the latter are entitled to an equal share with the former in the merit, to say nothing of the pecuniary result, of the production.

It is further to be noted that the dependence of the two parties is not wholly mutual. It is admitted that the manual laborer is dependent on the ability of the capitalist employer for the opportunity to labor in any largely productive way, and that the latter is dependent on the former. But it seems to be overlooked that, while the latter can do all that the former can, the former cannot do all that the latter can. Karl Marx makes it his main indictment of the present industrial system and a reason why it should give place to collectivism that all the surplus product of labor—that is, all save the bare pittance necessary for subsistence—is appropriated by the employer, who is a mere exploiter of labor, himself creating no value. Leaving out of account for the present the contradiction of the bare pittance allegation by a multitude of facts, the doctrine that the employer or *entrepreneur* produces nothing is easily refuted. It has already been seen how great is the increase of product from organization and skillful distribution of the laborers, and that the power to effect this to much advantage resides in only a few minds. One can see at a glance

what would be the result, or rather the lack of result, if a thousand Italians or other not highly intelligent laborers were set to work to build a railway through any section of the country without some directing mind. Not a rod of the road would be constructed—this, too, without saying anything concerning preliminary engineering. It is seen, again, in the difference in the success of different industrial enterprises where the abilities of the operatives are practically the same and there can be no superiority or inferiority save in the management. There are, for instance, in Massachusetts one hundred and thirty-seven cotton factories, of which eighty-seven make more or less net profits for their shareholders, while fifty make no net profits at all, and some of them sustain losses. Yet the same wages were paid, and the manual labor performed was as efficient in those making no profits as in the others. Admitting that there are certain accidental elements contributing to the poor showing of the one set and the good showing of the other, it is still palpable that the substantial difference is in the character of the men who direct the business.

Another part of Marx's argument is more subtle and more likely to mislead. It is to the effect that every product comprises three elements—the material which has been elaborated, the effect of the wear and waste of tools and machinery used in its production, and the labor expended. The value of the first two reappears in the new product, and is precisely the same as that which has disappeared from the material and the instruments. The remaining value, that is, all the real value of the product, is the result of manual labor and, therefore, rightly belongs to the manual laborer. But of this he insists that the larger part goes to the exploiter of labor, who produces nothing. It can easily be shown that Marx wholly leaves out the chief psychical factors in production. His argument is valid only as it applies to physical effort and effect. But, aside from this, it is subject to a *reductio ad absurdum*. Nearly always, in any considerable establishment, there are not only different machines, widely varying in productive power, but there are also certain processes of the simple handicraft order. Ten men work side by side. Two of them operate a machine of which the value of the product is twenty dollars a day. Three work with one producing the value of forty-five dollars a day. Five

of them are doing simple mechanical work worth in the aggregate ten dollars a day. Now, according to Marx's theory, here are three sets of men, entitled respectively to ten, fifteen, and two dollars a day per man; and it is to be noted that the exertion is, if anything, less in the more highly paid than in the less highly paid. There would seem to be some absurdity in this on the very face of it.

I said that Marx took no account of the psychical factors in production. It may furthermore be said that he does not take account of even all the physical factors—only of those implied in the human effort put forth. But nature does something in the creation of wealth, always cooperating under required conditions. Indeed, nature is the principal producer, the human agency being almost exclusively concerned in furnishing the proper conditions. Mr. Mallock\* makes this evident in his supposed case of three cultivators of the soil. Each has his plot of ground; each puts in the same amount of work; and all are presumed to be equally intelligent and equally diligent. But the product is in the ratio of fifteen, twelve, and nine. To be consistent, Marx would have to say that these amounts are produced severally by the respective laborers. The common sense of the ordinary thinker would assert that, while the productive powers of the men are equal, those of the natural agents are unequal—that is, the difference is owing to the character of the soil. We are compelled to admit that nature varies more in this respect than do the physical powers of man. What is true in the case of land is true, also, of material in the form of capital or machinery. Evidently, so far as manual labor is concerned, while we may readily see that more is contributed to the creation of wealth by the same number of men than formerly—for the facts of better compensation, a higher standard of living, and, consequently, more physical vigor would imply this—yet this accounts for only a small fraction of the relative increase in production. For the rest we must look to invention and to the psychical elements involved in management and direction. How much is to be attributed to these has only recently begun to be apprehended. In fact, these extraordinary powers have never existed in anything like their present large measure till

\* *Labor and the Popular Welfare*, pp. 95-100.

within the last hundred years. As previously intimated, this power of the *entrepreneur* is found in only a few minds. Mr. Mallock makes an estimate, and gives good reason for it, that one sixteenth of the population really produces nearly two thirds of the wealth. These considerations ought to be sufficient, even if there were no others, to account for the great disparity of wealth without presuming any vicious principle.

There is a class of thinkers who, while they are compelled, in view of the facts cited, to admit that there is a palpable difference in the wealth-producing power of individuals, yet insist that it exists to only a limited extent. They do not believe that the vast accumulations made by certain persons can be legitimately acquired. They hold that beyond a limited amount such fortunes are gained only by means implying the withholding of the share properly belonging to others, and that no one can rightfully amass an estate of two or three millions without defrauding others. Just where the line should be drawn they do not undertake to determine. But, so far as can be seen in the light which investigation has thrown on the subject, no limit need be fixed. The only condition to be observed is that no one shall have less because some other has more. If this is insisted on there will be no danger that one or a very small number will possess all the wealth of the community; and that is what seems to be feared by those who look with concern upon the vast accumulations which have been made by some in recent years.

Of course, it is in the very nature of things that great wealth will be the portion of only a minority, just as great learning, extraordinary talent, and transcendent genius are the portion of only comparatively few. For, as we have seen, the wealth-creating ability is analogous to other mental endowments. Though it is found in only a small number, the great majority who have it are not losers, but rather great gainers, because of this fact. A concrete case may help us to see this more clearly. In a New England town off the line of the railroads there are about one hundred and sixty families. There are two villages. There is no large business concern in the town, farming being the principal occupation. There are some half a dozen professional men, the usual quota of mechanics, and three or four country merchants. Most of the families are in

moderately comfortable conditions. The number of paupers reaches about the ordinary average in such communities. There are in the town three men of wealth. One of them is a man of national reputation. These three men own about five times as much property as all the rest of the inhabitants together—that is, less than one fiftieth of the families possess about five sixths of the wealth. There is no complaint in the town because these men are so rich. There are no indications that anyone is poorer on that account. On the contrary, it is tolerably evident that the people as a whole are better off because of it. In a neighboring town, where there are no rich men, certainly the general condition is far from being any better. Now, this may be an exceptional instance. No doubt there are cases where the wealth of the few is at the expense of the many; but this is not a necessary or general consequence. In the *Forum* for November, 1889, Mr. Shearman maintained that one seventieth of the people of the United States own two thirds of the property. This is singularly near the state of things in the little country town just spoken of. We may freely grant that such disparity and such concentration are not the normal or the healthiest condition of things. And we may do this without at all admitting that the causes of this inequality reside wholly or principally in our vicious methods of taxation. These certainly are exceedingly imperfect—as, indeed, any system must be—and in some of their features needlessly oppressive. But, bad as they are, these systems are insufficient to account for the existing conditions.

It needs no formal argument to prove that considerable numbers of men have accumulated wealth through unfair means. Selfishness is an almost universally prevailing vice. While in many it is restrained or subordinated, in others it palpably breaks out in fraud, in taking advantage of the weak, and in scarcely concealed robbery. Frequently, it defeats itself, but, unhappily, not always; and often a man becomes enormously rich because he has taken that which is justly the wealth of others. But this no more disproves that great wealth may be legitimately acquired, than the obvious fact that rogues and knaves by the thousand secure a living by unjust means proves that a living can be obtained in no other way. Sometimes great fortunes are made by speculation. I use the term



"speculation" here in its narrower sense, to indicate a sort of transaction in which one gains what others inevitably lose, stock gambling being a typical example of these transactions. No wealth is created by this method of business. The community as a whole is not one whit better off on account of it. The great mass of men in moderate circumstances are not greatly affected by these transactions. But there is a particular fact which should be considered here. Men who figure on the exchange do not generally belong to the industrial army. It makes little difference to the latter whether Mr. Smith makes three or four millions out of Mr. Jones, or whether the latter has relieved the former of a similar amount in some shrewd deal. Mr. Brown may have been so acute in discerning the set of the speculative current at one period as to become a multifold millionaire; at another time he may have so miscalculated it as to be compelled to earn his daily bread in some honest occupation. It makes no difference to the great body of honest toilers. They are neither richer nor poorer by these ups and downs in the financial careers of the men alluded to.

But it is otherwise when a few men form combinations by which they control the market and compel the great body of consumers to pay more than the normal price for the necessities of life. In this way a few may get enormously rich at the expense of the many; and both the poor and the well to do—and the former more than the latter—are made to contribute to their unrighteous accumulations. But we must still insist that not all great fortunes come in this or in kindred ways. It is clearly conceivable that men may secure for themselves great wealth, while they are at the same time helping others to improve their condition. Nor is this a mere conception of the imagination; it is often actualized in real life. When Cornelius Vanderbilt entered upon his project of uniting several railway corporations into one trunk line between Chicago and the Atlantic seaboard, it is hardly to be presumed that he was actuated by a merely philanthropic sentiment. It is possible, though not certain, that he had no thought of benefiting any but himself. It is evident that he did benefit himself to the extent of some millions of dollars; but there is no reason to believe that the poverty of any was increased. On the contrary, the resulting reduction in freight charges tended to increase the wealth of



every Western farmer and Eastern wage-earner; for the one sold his product at a larger profit, and the other purchased it at a lower price.

The consequences of accumulations which involve injustice on the part of the fortune builder are certainly evil. I do not mean by this legal or technical fraud, but such taking advantage of others, in ways that the civil law cannot reach and that even public opinion does not always condemn, as implies that the gain of one is conditioned on the loss of another. This is not only an ethical wrong, but it is a social and economic evil. It gives certain persons more than they can use to advantage and deprives others of the comforts of life. Another and more general evil is that great wealth gives its possessor power over those who have small competencies. The facilities for production are, as is charged by the socialists, in the hands of the wealthy; and it is possible to use them as a means of oppression and extortion. This is not only possible, but is likely to become actual with the unprincipled and the selfish. There are many instances where such advantage is taken and the poor are made still poorer. It is not good that one man or a whole class of men should be placed at the mercy of another man or combination of men. Inevitably, their power will sometimes be used to the further depression of those who are already sadly depressed and to keeping them from ever rising. It is true that social forces are always operating to counteract this tendency to oppression; but these are never sufficient to wholly prevent it. There are multiplied instances of degradation, want, and suffering caused by industrial oppressions; and the greed, extortion, and cruelty displayed call loudly for redress.

But it does not follow that such abuses are the natural result of individual accumulation. On the contrary, many and vast benefits accrue. First, there is the universally admitted fact that a very large amount of capital is necessary as a condition for the profitable employment of labor. Even the temporary withdrawal of any considerable portion of the wealth used in production occasions great loss and distress to workingmen. It is not a sufficient reply to say that in former times, when great capitals rarely existed, the manual laborer maintained himself and his family in comparative comfort. Indeed, as a matter of fact, the condition of the average laborer was far from being

as satisfactory as now. And we are to remember that in civilized nations population has so greatly increased within the last two centuries that, without the almost incredible modern developments in machinery, which imply an immense increase in capital, production would have fallen far short of the demand and the sufferings of the poor would have become almost insupportable. Again, these accumulations, where they are legitimate, imply an ability on the part of their possessors which by no means exhausts itself in the acquisition. This ability adds to the welfare of many another. It plans and carries on great enterprises, and thus furnishes employment to thousands of laborers. As we have seen, such ability is rare; and yet on its existence and exercise depends, in large measure, the prosperity of the great mass of laboring men. There is not a very large number of men who can successfully manage business enterprises of even moderate proportions; not simply because most men lack the requisite capital, but also because they have not the necessary mental equipment. Of all who undertake to do business on more than the most ordinary scale only a few succeed. It has been estimated that ninety per cent fail sooner or later. This may be an exaggeration; but if it be only half true the lesson is the same. It is better for the large majority to be assured of a fair wage regularly paid, than to assume responsibilities with which only men of extraordinary sagacity are competent to cope.

To this kind of security there is for the masses no other alternative than the establishment of State socialism; and, whatever modifications the present system may undergo in the socialistic direction, modern society is not disposed to accept socialism as a whole, with its untested industrial theories. The benefits of such a system could be proved only by experience; and our communities are not willing to be the subjects of experiment on so gigantic a scale, where almost infinite risks are involved. It is admitted by nearly all the sober and candid advocates of collectivism that, even assuming the soundness of the theory and its practicability, it must come about gradually and not till after a lapse of many years. Rodbertus puts it at five hundred, others at a century or more. But what are we to do in the meantime? Evidently, we must go on with the present system, giving to it such modifications as investigation

and discussion may suggest. Such changes are going on all the time. We may expect they will continue and, perhaps, be more frequent and more radical in the future than in the past.

All parties acknowledge that great social evils exist. An excessive optimism, that sees nothing to mend, has no proper place in the mind of any candid thinker. The removal of these evils must come from either of two sources. On the one hand, those who are unfavorably affected must demand justice and equity, and their voice must be heard. They have certain means of emancipation in their own hands, and through organization and agitation they are doing something to diminish the hardships of their lot. They may labor under many and great errors—this is inevitable—but education, experience, and candor will correct them. The other source of rectification referred to lies with the rich and prosperous. It may be laid down as a stable principle that the right of every man to all the wealth he honestly acquires, however much it may be, does not carry with it the right to use it in any way that may suit caprice or minister to selfish desires. There are duties, as well as rights, and *noblesse oblige* has its application here more aptly than anywhere else. Between two parties rights and obligations do not always precisely coincide. One may have no right to demand a service of me, while I am, nevertheless, in duty bound to render it. The obligation may emanate from a higher source and be evolved from a larger relationship. If I see a man in great distress, from which it is in my power to relieve him without unreasonable cost to myself, while he may have no claim upon me for this help, yet it is clearly my duty to render it. It is the distinction between justice and benevolence. They are both equally binding, but they are not the same. The one can be made the subject of civil law, the other cannot. The one may be enforced in the tribunals of justice, the other may not. But in the great court of public sentiment the man who fails to respond to the call of humanity is summarily and universally condemned.

The duty of wealth is not exhausted in affording aid to individuals in misfortune or in public, and even profuse, charities. To the community which has furnished the conditions of great accumulations something is owing. Sometimes this debt is discharged wholly or in part in the endowment of schools and

colleges, in the bestowment of libraries and museums and the buildings and means to contain and support them, in the founding of lecture courses, in the establishment of hospitals and other great charities, in the presentation of parks and fountains and other works of art. It is so deeply seated in the convictions of men that private wealth ought to contribute to these purposes—not because the public has a claim, but from a sense of higher social and moral obligations—that when a man of vast possessions dies and leaves no bequests for such objects there is not only disappointment, but something like execration, generally suppressed, it is true, yet not wholly concealed. There is, furthermore, binding upon the man of wealth the duty to use his property for the economic welfare of the community. There is much censure in our time of the “idle rich,” and it is wholly legitimate. Generally speaking, no man of physical and mental health has a right to be unemployed. One should, at least, produce as much as one consumes. Inherited wealth implies no right to spend life in mere indulgence. There are thousands who claim this right and who are as useless to the world as any of the army of tramps and penniless loafers which infests our communities. The responsibility of the rich is not met when they simply deal justly in paying the tradesmen who serve them, the domestics whom they employ, or the artists whose productions they buy. It is their duty to use a reasonable amount of their property as capital and to be themselves engaged in production, thus both adding to the wealth of the community and providing opportunity to those who desire to labor. It is not designed to condemn those who, possessing large wealth either of their own creation or by inheritance, devote themselves to philanthropy and the public service. Such men are a greater benefit to society thus than they could be in any other way.

Another stricture is in order. Rich men, in claiming the right to do what they will with their own, will do well to remember that this does not imply the liberty of extravagant, useless, and wasteful expenditure. No man, no matter how rich he may be, may so destroy property that out of it shall come no addition of value to himself or others. A generous and bountiful style, it is true, is not only allowable, but is often demanded. A certain high standard of living is desirable, even

for men in moderate circumstances. There is, nevertheless, a profusion of expenditure which is ostentatious and vulgar, which ministers neither to the welfare of the individual or family nor to the advantage of the community, and which cannot be otherwise properly characterized than as a wicked waste of opportunity. It is hardly necessary to add, especially as something has already been said on this topic, that wealth cannot be innocently used as a means of oppression. Men may not rightly combine their fortunes to put down competition, destroy the business of their rivals, ruin independent producers, get control of the world's markets, levy toll upon the people like the bandit barons of the Middle Ages, and thus build colossal fortunes for themselves. Such uses of wealth are violations of ethical and social laws, and they have in them the seeds of dire retribution.

*Geo. M. Steele.*

## ART. VII.—METHODIST EPISCOPACY IN TRANSITION.

METHODIST episcopacy is both apostolic and scriptural. It is apostolic, in that it first came into existence as the outgrowth of an extraordinary spiritual movement, after the manner of primitive episcopacy; and it is scriptural, in that it was founded in remarkable harmony with scriptural precedent and under the liberal charter of self-government which the New Testament grants to every Christian organization. Every friend of Christian unity and Christian liberty, and especially every Methodist, should ever thank God that Mr. Wesley was led to set apart the first Methodist bishops himself, without interposition of any prelate claiming to exercise his functions by an authority derived from an unbroken line of successors to the original apostles. Beyond all doubt, this fiction of an "historic" episcopacy is the greatest barrier in the way of Christian unity throughout the world to-day; and the most practical, as well as the most effective, protest which has been made against it is the widespread presence of another episcopacy—historic, without having any history to be ashamed of, and apostolic, without possessing a long succession of prelates many of whom were models of all that apostles should not be. This modern form of episcopacy is rapidly extending its influence, and seems destined to a still wider and more rapid extension in the future.

I have used the word "outgrowth" as descriptive of the origin of Methodist episcopacy, meaning that God directed by providential tokens those who first gave it a definite shape. No one among the early founders of Methodism, from Mr. Wesley down, anticipated at the outset that such a feature would ever be impressed on the Methodist system. It took shape very gradually; and, while its formal acknowledgment by the election of Bishops Coke and Asbury as bishops of an independent Church had some of the suddenness of a surprise, this momentous act was in reality but the culmination of a long series of events which logically led up to it and which could hardly have terminated differently. It follows naturally that a system which, from the very first, was subject to the laws of providential development can never acquire the character of a rigid framework beyond the reach of either amendment or adjust-

ment to new emergencies. As a matter of fact, it has been subject to modification from the beginning, and will, no doubt, continue to be so as long as the Church retains the vitality of a growing body. It ought to be admitted as inevitable, therefore, by every Church accepting this form of episcopacy, that the system will change from time to time; and the discussion of modifications which may seem desirable and at times inevitable should never be regarded as implying disloyalty to the system itself. As a simple matter of history, the episcopacy which was adopted at the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church has already been modified in several important respects, until at the present day, so far as its practical workings are concerned, it differs very widely from that which bore the same name a century ago.

What were the chief distinctive features of the Methodist episcopacy in the days of Coke and Asbury? In the first place, it was presbyterial, as distinct from the sacerdotal, or prelatical, episcopacy with which the world had become familiar in the Roman, Eastern, and Anglican Churches. Next, it was general, as distinguished from the diocesan feature which many maintained had been handed down from the apostles and had thus become as inviolable as the episcopacy itself. The bishop was not regarded as inseparable from a limited, and usually very small, piece of territory, but could have duties assigned to him in any part of the wide domain of the Church. In the third place, the position which he held was regarded as an office bestowed upon him by the suffrages of his equals, and not as the prerogative of an order received at the hands of superiors. In office he stood above his brethren; but in ministerial orders they were his equals. As such, he was amenable to these brethren for his conduct, could be placed on trial by them, and could make no appeal against their action to a higher order of ministers. In every feature of the episcopacy the supremacy of the Church and the subordination of the bishop were recognized. Lastly, it is to be noted that the bishop was not only a general superintendent, in the sense of exercising a general supervision over the Church, but that this supervision was of a militant character. The early Methodist bishop was expected to be a leader. The Church of Asbury's day was, in the best sense of the word, a militant Church. The supervision of the



bishop was that of a commander on the battlefield, and in every action he was expected in person to keep close behind the skirmish line. If his authority was very great, corresponding to the militant character of his office, his subordination was equally marked. The senior of the first two bishops once had his jurisdiction limited by a simple vote of his brethren, so that his status was made to correspond in a remarkable degree to that of a missionary bishop at the present day. It will thus be seen that Methodist episcopacy, as first formulated, was a very unique institution in the Christian world. Nothing exactly corresponding to it had been seen since the early days of Christianity. Under God, it owed its origin to the Church. In both of these respects it became a living protest against the prevailing "historic" error, that the Church owed its origin to the episcopacy and could not even exist without its presence and control.

It would be interesting to note the changes which gradually took place in the evolution of our episcopacy; but space will not permit this, nor is it necessary to notice them except in brief outline. It was quickly found that the bishops could not all be present at each Conference session, and this obligation was quietly dropped. The rapid extension of the work soon made it impossible for them to be present at all the circuits, and in consequence their faces began to be less and less familiar to the mass of the common people. The creation of a General Conference strengthened their position and added in some respects to their functions, but did not tend to draw them nearer to the people. Their judicial functions became more strictly defined, and their responsibilities in general more weighty, as time passed. There was no regular rotation in the presidency of the Annual Conferences; and in the New England Conference, where Bishop Hedding presided for five or six successive years, a "districted episcopacy" was for a time in practical existence, without any attention being called to the fact.\*

\* Since the above was written an article has appeared in *Zion's Herald*, written by Dr. D. H. Ela, in which the case as here presented is greatly strengthened. Dr. Ela says: "The general superintendency has not kept pace with the growth of the body. It has nothing like the acquaintance with, and supervision of, the Church which existed in earlier days. Indeed, it has been in danger of losing its vital relation to the body. Bishop Asbury presided at sixteen of the first nineteen sessions of the New England Conference. He knew personally every man, and visited annually nearly every circuit in the Conference. Bishop McKendree attended every session but one of the Conference from 1809 to 1817—the first five with Asbury. Bishop Hedding attended twenty of the twenty-six sessions from 1824 to 1849.

The Asburyan era practically came to a close in 1852. Three of the four bishops elected in that year were, each in his way, representatives of new ideas and new policies. The time was favorable for an advance in many directions. The separation of the Southern Conferences was a relief, not only from embittered controversy, but from an intolerable situation. A new wave of emigration was rolling westward. New educational institutions were springing into existence, and ministerial education had just received its highest indorsement by the election of Bishop Baker. The Missionary Society was just beginning to realize the purpose for which it had been founded, and in the great cities leading men were waking to the momentous responsibilities which confronted the Church. It was a time for great leaders and brave leadership; and at no period in our history have more capable men come to the front, both in the episcopacy and outside of it.

It was at or near this date that the first attempt was made to introduce a regular system into the work of supervising the Annual Conferences. To each bishop a certain number of Conferences was assigned for a period of twelve months; and, although these Conferences were not by any means selected with regard to contiguity of territory, yet a most important principle was thereby recognized and a still more important precedent established. Each bishop was placed in charge of a specified field for the term of twelve months. For that length of time the whole work was divided into districts; and this policy prevails to the present day. As the years passed by the foreign missions began to enroll converts in many countries, and in due time Annual Conferences were organized in foreign lands, at first tentatively, but later with all the rights and privileges of Annual Conferences in the United States. These Conferences were placed under the permanent supervision of the several bishops, the same general superintendent in some cases retaining exclusive jurisdiction over a Conference for a dozen years or more. In this way another most important precedent was established, namely, that the

Down to 1854 no bishop presided alone in the Conference until he had attended at least one session of the Conference in company with an older bishop. Such acquaintance with, and personal supervision of, the Conference by the bishop has become year by year less possible and more neglected, till now it begins with the opening of the annual session and closes with the reading of the appointments."

"general itinerant superintendency" does not require an interchange of the supervision of the Conferences among the bishops every twelve months. Meanwhile, the creation of Judicial Conferences, the immense expansion of our publishing interests, the increase of benevolent societies in the Church, the growth of legislation, and the outline on the horizon of new questions of the greatest importance have all combined to add to the responsibilities of the bishops, and, at the same time, to withdraw them more and more from the sphere of active leadership which pertained to them during the Asburyan era.

It seems very probable that with the advent of a new century our Church will enter upon the third stage of her history. We are now in the closing years of the second era. Many changes have occurred during the past fifty years, and the end is not yet. In the early days of Asbury no one foresaw the rapid expansion of the country, both in territory and population, and certainly no one anticipated that before the close of the present century our ministers, in different parts of the world, would be witnessing for Christ in thirty-six different languages. No one foresaw, no one could have foreseen, the extraordinary development of new interests which has taken place; and hence it was simply impossible a century ago, or even half a century ago, to formulate a policy which would meet the demands of an era like the present. The episcopacy of a hundred years ago is not equal to present emergencies. A hundred Asburys could not now supervise the work as the one Asbury did it in the beginning; while it is as certain as any future and contingent event can be that the difficulties of the situation will increase rapidly, rather than diminish, with the lapse of years. A widespread impression prevails among our people that some parts of our present episcopal system need readjustment, in order to adapt the Church to her new responsibilities and prepare fully for the stupendous duties of the coming century. Among various proposals, perhaps the most prominent, as well as the most practical, is that of giving more definite fields of labor to the several general superintendents.

The demand for a "districted episcopacy" is more urgent and much more general at the present time than is commonly supposed. No episcopal system can permanently succeed which

does not include the continuous personal supervision of a responsible leader. It need hardly be said that our present system fails conspicuously at this point. A presiding bishop cannot form plans with any expectation of himself helping to carry them into effect. He knows perfectly well that when he leaves the brethren before him it will probably be to return no more. He is the presiding officer of an ecclesiastical assembly; but he is not, and cannot be, the leader of a militant army. His duties are assigned to him in such a way as to give him a maximum of authority and a minimum of responsibility. He is rarely obliged to face the results of his own Conference administration. He acquires but little local knowledge and wields but little local influence. He deals with the most vital interests of a thousand of his brethren, without having a personal acquaintance with one in ten or, perhaps, one in twenty among them. He is a "general" superintendent, and yet will not dare to decide any pending question outside the ever-shifting boundaries of the Conferences allotted to him. To the mass of the people he is an invisible official, highly esteemed no doubt, but no longer filling the place in the public mind and heart which was held by Asbury and his earlier successors. In other words, our bishops are losing touch with the people. Large presiding elders' districts are pointed out within which no bishop has ever entered. Vast commonwealths there are within which no bishop ever goes except during the hurried session of an Annual Conference. The country circuits know the bishops only by name, and only the more important city churches can hope to receive their ministrations.

The attempt to maintain the present "systemless and outgrown" policy must soon be abandoned. To require sixteen men to interchange their fields of labor annually, to cut up these fields into detached and widely separated sections, to plan deliberately for useless travel, for a crossing and recrossing of one another's tracks, to waste time and strength and money for what most practical men will call naught, to attempt to extend this system to the ends of the earth, and calmly to propose to maintain it until the sixteen shall have become sixty or a hundred and sixty—all this seems so manifestly unwise and absurd that the mere statement of the case becomes its own condemnation. The late Bishop Kingsley,

speaking of this policy, once said to me in India, "It is the wildest scheme I have ever known good men to propose." The good sense of our people will demand, is now demanding, something more practical and more in keeping with the original spirit of our episcopal system.

The mere statement of this proposal will, no doubt, call forth an appeal to the third Restrictive Rule. For some reason, it seems always to be taken for granted that the word "plan" in that rule refers solely to the present absence of plan in the practical working of our itinerant general superintendency. To modify a plan, if this absence of plan can be called a plan at all, is not to destroy it. To develop and perfect a plan which exists only in imperfect outline is the farthest possible remove from destroying it. What was the original plan? It was "general," but not "diocesan." It was "itinerant," in the Methodist sense of that word. The preachers were itinerants, but were restricted to circuits, although constantly changed from one circuit to another. As time passed they became less and less itinerant, until at last the term became a purely ecclesiastical one, meaning only that the preacher was subject to more or less frequent changes of residence. His actual itinerating in many cases now consists in walking about fifty feet from his own door to the adjacent church. A somewhat similar, if less marked, change has come over the itinerant "plan" of the bishops. The Asburyan plan has long since broken down, and the bishops by mutual agreement now "district" their work. Every reader of our Church papers is familiar with the "Plan of Episcopal Visitation," which, being interpreted, means the formal districting of certain Conferences. This has been done so long and has been approved by so many General Conferences that it is too late to appeal to any restrictive rule against it.

If, now, the General Conference at Cleveland were to relieve the bishops of the responsibility of making out these plans and do it for them it is hardly conceivable that anyone would object to the action as unconstitutional. And if the General Conference made out the plan for two years, instead of one, the action would be equally legal. The next step is an easy one and in plain sight. Let the General Conference make out the plan for four years, instead of one, and the task is nearly com-

plete. It remains only to form the Conferences into groups or districts geographically, as well as ecclesiastically, and to make the bishop assigned to each district responsible for it for four years, in order to complete a development of a plan which would give new vigor to our Church. This change would not "destroy" the plan laid down in the Discipline; it would only reduce it to system. It would make it vastly more effective. It would eliminate the obsolete elements in the plan and make it more practical, as well as more sensible. Each bishop would be subject to a removal quadrennially, and hence would be still an itinerant, like other Methodist preachers. Each bishop would be subject to appointment to any part of the wide field of the Church, and hence his superintendency would be "general." If it be said that the bishops should travel at large through all the work the answer is obvious—no one does. For fifty years past no one has been able to perform this feat. Bishop Ames quietly refused to cross the ocean, and the General Conference approved his administration. Bishop Simpson never saw India or China. It is morally certain that even our youngest bishops will never complete the round of all the Conferences in the United States. What is the use, then, of trying to keep up an illogical make-believe about our "general" superintendency? No living man could discharge the duties which we try to make ourselves believe we are exacting from our bishops.

The relation of this proposed change to our missionary episcopacy is obvious. When it was first proposed to provide a resident bishop for Liberia the question was viewed from the narrowest possible standpoint. The policy had just been adopted of sending no more white missionaries to the African coast, and even the occasional visits of the bishops were considered too perilous to be kept up. But how should the Liberian ministers be ordained? It was chiefly to provide for this that the original plan of a missionary episcopacy was devised, and it is not strange that from the first it proved a failure. The election of Bishop Taylor precipitated a heated controversy concerning questions of "status" and administration; and, as might have been expected, our foreign missionaries lifted up their voices against an episcopacy which seemed so narrow and worked so unsatisfactorily. The action of the General Con-



ference in 1888, whatever else may be said for or against it, certainly put an immediate and complete end to the controversy then pending; and thus far the new plan has not given rise to any special complaints. Mere questions of ecclesiastical status have no value whatever so long as the interests of the Church are successfully administered and conserved. But if the policy indicated above had been adopted in the first place there need never have been a missionary episcopacy. It would only have been necessary to create an episcopal district in a given foreign land and assign a bishop to it, subject to the same restrictions as his brethren in the home land.

The present restrictions imposed on missionary bishops work no hardship of any kind and do no possible harm; but they are a trifle absurd. When one of the greatest and best of English prelates was on his way to Calcutta, many years ago, he made an agreement to join a nonconformist minister who was on board at daily prayer, and during the first half of the voyage the two brethren greatly enjoyed their little meeting. When, however, they passed the longitude of Cape Town the Anglican told his nonconformist brother that he could no longer meet him in prayer, since he was now within the borders of his own diocese. This seems absurd enough, no doubt; but is our own rule more logical which forbids a man who has authority to ordain in Lucknow and Bombay to perform the same duty after he passes Aden, at the mouth of the Red Sea, even though requested to do so by sixteen bishops?

The permanent policy of our Church with reference to the episcopal supervision of our foreign missions can hardly yet be regarded as definitely settled. The action of 1888 is not accepted by all parties as the final adjustment of this difficult question. By many it is still regarded as, at best, only a temporary measure; and some of our wisest leaders are strongly of the opinion that it would be better to adhere to the old policy of sending out bishops from home to inspect the work and to preside at the Conferences. For this policy it is claimed (1) that the work should be regularly inspected by parties acting on behalf of the Missionary Society; (2) that the General Committee needs the information which so many visiting bishops would be able to give; (3) that the bishops would be able to spread their observations before the Church in such a way as to



stimulate missionary interest ; (4) that the unity of the Church would be thus conserved, and the workers abroad be kept in touch with their brethren in the home land.

These points may all be conceded ; but the missionary abroad is quick to observe that they only indirectly touch the question of episcopal supervision. A Methodist bishop is certainly something more than an inspector general of missions. As before remarked, he must be a leader, must be able to plan campaigns and execute his own plans, must have administrative ability, and must in person attend to many matters which a visiting bishop would not think of attempting. It is a small matter to inspect a work, but a very weighty task to create a work to be inspected. If Mr. Wesley had instructed Francis Asbury to inspect the work in America and then return and report to him in person, what possible good would his visit have accomplished, and where would American Methodism have been to-day ? As to the advice of the visiting bishops at the meetings of the General Committee, it cannot be denied that the presence of so many able men who have traveled widely over the world adds greatly to the interest of such meetings ; but, as to the practical results, it may be said that in recent years it has more than once happened that all the advice tendered by visiting bishops did not affect the appropriations to the extent of five hundred dollars.

In the mission field, above all other places, the presence of a superintending leader is of the utmost importance. The isolation of the workers, the inexperience of most of the convert preachers, the pioneer character of the work, the necessity of devising new measures, the constant care to make organization keep pace with progress, the liability to dissension—these and a score of other reasons might be named as indicating the urgent need of a superintending leader on the field. The old plan has not worked successfully. Harmony among the workers has not been the rule in all our fields. The administration has not always been uniform. The policy pursued has not tended to produce leaders, but rather to repress them. If it is a mistake to give authority without responsibility, it is a much more serious error to give responsibility without authority. Slowly, but steadily, the missionaries in the field are yielding to the conviction that a series of annual visits from an ever-

changing number of bishops, however desirable in some respects, does not constitute episcopal supervision, in any proper sense of the word. If free to choose, they would not propose a missionary episcopacy ; but they are rapidly reaching the conclusion that the name matters little, provided their practical wants are met. They are Methodists working under the Methodist Episcopal system, and very naturally they wish to have all the working machinery of their Church on the ground and in proper working order.

So far from reversing the policy adopted in 1888, it ought to be extended to all our larger mission fields. India urgently needs two, and should have three, episcopal superintendents. The enforced absence of the present superintendent for long periods is unfavorable to the work. In providing for the several fields a wide freedom of action should be exercised. The work is greater than the bishop. Exceptions should be made without hesitation when occasion demands them. If possible, each field should have its own bishop ; but, if need be, two or more countries might be assigned to one person. If the word "missionary" is offensive to the Germans eliminate it ; but let the bishop become one of the Germans and go to stay. If it is considered important to have certain of the home bishops go abroad to inspect our missions by all means send them ; but do not let this in any way interfere with the normal administration of the work under a bishop on the ground. A bishop is a servant of the Church, and can serve in any capacity or perform any duty to which the voice of the Church calls him. Let this general rule be observed, and future changes can safely be left to those on whom responsibility shall rest when the necessity for change makes itself felt.

*J. M. Shoburn*

ART. VIII.—THE SONG OF SONGS—A STUDY OF ITS  
PLAN AND PURPORT.

OUR purpose is to set forth the structure of this most remarkable composition as we may trace it in the writing itself. If we are successful there results the surest basis for an interpretation which shall be void of vagaries and extravagances such as have been most common and most harmful in the past. It will be our aim to indicate some portions of Scripture that prepared the way for this Song of Songs, and other portions that followed its appearance and are the highest tribute to the influence which it exerted on the religious development of the Hebrews. Our attempt will be within the realm of reconstructive criticism. Herein each advance is attended with greatest difficulties.

We would do injustice to Methodist scholarship, and also to the generous encouragement of scholarship on the part of the Book Concern, if we were to fail to mention two recent translations of this Song of Songs—one made by the late Dr. James Strong, and the other by Professor Milton S. Terry. The Song is worked out, in each of these translations, into minute dramatic detail. Herein alone is there agreement; for the understanding of the Song is different with each author. Dr. Strong accepts the view that the poem is a celebration of Solomon's marriage with a daughter of Pharaoh. It is accordingly constructed to represent the seven days during which the marriage festivities were in process of completion. Perhaps no terser and more forcible judgment against this view can be found than that of Adam Clarke, who says: "For my part, I doubt the propriety of this technical arrangement, and do not think that anything of the kind was intended by the author. The division is not obvious and, therefore, in my apprehension, not natural." Dr. Terry sets forth the view he has adopted in these words: "The heroine of this poetic drama is to be understood as a fair young maiden of northern Palestine whom King Solomon is supposed to have sought in vain to win. She resists all his blandishments, rejects all his offers, and remains true to her shepherd lover, to whom she is at last restored." It must be said of the *dramatis personæ* and

the dramatic situations, as set forth in Dr. Terry's translation, that they are "not obvious" and, to my apprehension, "not natural."

It is not unforeseen that the interpretation we propose may be regarded as "not obvious" and, therefore, "not natural." Yet, as it is simple and is easily confirmed by the writing itself, it will certainly have the advantage of approximating quite closely to the obvious and the natural. There are but three parties in the poem. They are the Beloved, the loved one, and the daughters of Jerusalem. It is mainly in the vocative case that the daughters of Jerusalem are made to appear. They are regarded as interested in all that concerns the Beloved and the loved one; and in one case (vi, 1) they wish to seek the Beloved along with the loved one. They are appealed to again and again. Once they are called the daughters of Zion (iii, 11). With the exception of the portions addressed to the daughters of Jerusalem, the whole poem is made up of recitatives and dialogues by the Beloved and the loved one. All the interest, all the charm, all the exquisite beauty in this production center in these two.

To the Hebrew scholar the language of the Song presents an attractiveness unequaled by any other part of the Old Testament of equal length. The peculiar choiceness of the language, the unusualness of many words, the remarkable metaphors present a mine of wealth to every investigator. Much in the poem will be obscure until this field for research has been more thoroughly explored. Still, with all these obscurities, the two chief characters, bound together by a changeless love, draw us to them and win our interest and our admiration. Various relationships of these two parties are pointed out by striking Hebrew words, which each party employs when addressing the other. The most common of these is דוד, *dôd*, and is translated "Beloved." It is the chief name applied to the lover. The loved one utters her deep and abiding love in language which constitutes no small part of the charm of the poem. This Hebrew word in Scripture is more often rendered "David" than "Beloved;" and there is but little doubt that those who first sung the Song kept constantly in mind the thought of David. The Beloved was the new David. Such suggestion meets the reader at almost every turn in the thought. A sec-

and important name is שְׁלֹמֹה, *Shelōmōh*, and means "One giving peace." There is but one passage in the canticle where this word is the name of the far-famed king Solomon who astonished the Hebrews with his luxuriousness and splendor. Elsewhere it refers to the lover, whoever he may be. Much of the uncertainty in the interpretations of the Song may be traced to the failure to make this distinction in the use of שְׁלֹמֹה. The lover was the Peace-giver. His dwelling place was Jerusalem, where peace is taught. This new Solomon is the new David, the Beloved, and worthy of the soul's best love. There are two other names which are applied to the lover. They are common nouns and are words which have been employed as centers for the noblest thought of the Hebrew Bible. The first word is אָח, '*āch*. This word is the Hebrew for "brother." It might be urged that this term is not used definitely as descriptive of the Beloved. Our reply would be that the wish is expressed on the part of the loved one that the shepherd might be as a brother. It is, besides, indisputable that the Beloved calls the object of his love his sister. One last word, and it completes the list of names applied to the Beloved, is מֶלֶךְ, '*mélēkh*. The Beloved is, also, the king.

There are six terms employed to designate the loved one of the Song. She is first called יָפֵה, '*yáphéh*. She is the fairest among women. It would seem that the reason for this name, the ground of her beauty, is to be found in that passionate appeal which begins,

O reveal to me,  
Thou whom my soul loveth.

Her love beautifies her and makes her the fairest. She is also called רֹעִי, '*rā'yāh*. In the translation we may render this word "shepherdess." Yet it does not indicate a woman who acts as a shepherd; rather, it means one who is under shepherding care. A third term is יֹנָה, '*yónāh*. This epithet is translated "dove." The word is a term of pure and affectionate greeting. The fourth term is כַּלָּה, '*kállāh*. This word is uniformly rendered "bride;" and much of the strength of the argument relied upon to prove the Song a bridal song is deduced from this word. Yet the word is just as easily and naturally rendered "perfect one;" and this change removes many difficulties. Another word is אָחוֹת, '*āchóth*. The one

loved is called "sister;" and this epithet leads her to wish that he might be called her own brother. The last word is שְׁלָמִית, *shulammith*. This epithet means the "one who has peace," and answers to the word שָׁלֵם, which means "He who gives peace."

These terms of endearment reciprocally employed by the two principals in the Song group themselves in four pairs and are suggestive of its purpose. The following observations may be made without fear of contradiction:

I. מֶלֶךְ, "king," and יָפִי, "beauty," are terms applied to Jehovah and to his chosen city of abode. Thus the author of the fiftieth psalm writes:

Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty,  
God hath shown.

Also in the Lamentations we find these significant words:

They hiss and wag their heads  
At the daughter of Jerusalem:  
"Is this the city that they called  
The perfection of beauty,  
The joy of the whole land?"—Lam. ii, 15.

The repeated and familiar references in the Psalms and elsewhere to Jehovah as king make it unnecessary to establish this fact by quotations.

II. דָּוִד, or "David," is used in later Hebrew of that unique Person who was to be Jehovah's Representative. Thus we read these remarkable utterances:

And he shall feed them,  
My servant David;  
He shall feed them,  
And he shall be their shepherd.—Ezek. xxxiv, 23

Or, again, that other remarkable passage:

And David my servant  
Shall be king over them;  
And they all shall have one shepherd.—Ezek. xxxvii, 24.

These passages also give warrant for the word רֹעֶיָה, which is used of her who receives the shepherding care.

III. The third pair of terms are שָׁלֵם and שְׁלָמִית. At heart, these words mean "giving peace," "having peace."

Passage after passage in the later literature of the Hebrews is rooted in this thought. Thus we read:

I will make with them  
A covenant of peace.—Ezek. xxxvii, 26.

Or, again, we read:

For ye shall go forth with joy,  
And be led forth with peace.—Isa. lv, 12.

Here are the new Solomon and the Shulammite.

IV. The last of the four pairs of terms are *אָהֶב* and *אֶחָת*. These are the Hebrew words for "brother" and "sister." The word "sister" was often used in later Hebrew as a designation of a people. Thus we read such utterances as "Thine elder sister is Samaria" (Ezek. xvi, 46), and "Behold, this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom" (Ezek. xvi, 49). These passages are warrant sufficient to prove that a people, in the time of Ezekiel, was rightly regarded in the light of a sister to other peoples. It is but a natural extension of this mode of expression to regard the protector as a brother. The terms "dove" and "perfect one" are terms of endearment used by the lover; and she who is loved offers in her speech no corresponding ones.

We conclude from the above statements that the Beloved is Jehovah or his Representative, and that the loved one is the chosen people or their city. The theme of the Song is the love between these two. It will now be our aim to set forth how this theme is carried out in the poem itself. We will be at great disadvantage in this endeavor, because we cannot, in the limits of this article, present the translation upon which rest some of the arguments for the view which we present. Yet we trust to avoid the charge of being obscure. The prologue and the epilogue are very easily separable. As they are quite brief and very important in the clews they furnish to the meaning of the beautiful Song we will give them in full.

PROLOGUE: I, 2-4.

With his mouth he kissed me with kisses;  
O, thy caresses were better than wine.  
For fragrance thy ointments [are] best;  
Thy name was fresh ointment;  
Therefore maidens love thee.  
He drew me on;  
After thee we ran.



The king brought me to his courts.  
 We were glad, rejoiced in thee,  
 We remembered thy caresses above wine.  
 The upright love thee.

It is to be observed that in this prologue the one who is loved speaks. Her words are redolent with the sweet signs and influences of love. These are caresses and perfumes and a name better than perfumes. Such a fresh, unrestrained expression of love characterizes noblest natures when touched for the first time by love. And she gladly follows him whom she loves:

He drew me on;  
 After thee we ran.

The dominant thoughts in the prologue are of the king and his courts, of the joy and gladness to be found with him, and of the memory of all his endearments. Love of the king is only with the upright. These words briefly outline the first part of the poem. They celebrate a period of faithful devotion and the joy incident thereto.

The epilogue is spoken by the Beloved and evidences his unabating love for her whom he has chosen.

EPILOGUE: VIII, 5-7.

Beneath the fir tree I awakened thee.  
 There thy mother travailed with thee;  
 There she who travailed brought thee forth.  
 Set me as a seal upon thy heart,  
 As a seal upon thy arm.  
 O, strong as death is love,  
 Relentless as the grave is zeal;  
 Its flames are the flames of fire,  
 Which is the brightness of Jehovah.  
 Many waters are not able  
 To quench love;  
 Rivers cannot o'erwhelm it.  
 Though men should give  
 All the wealth of their house for love,  
 They would be despicable to him.

Here is the close of this beautiful canticle. What follows is but a later addition, weak and scarcely intelligible; for it was added by the Jews as a flattering compliment to a nation which they would unite to themselves by some outward bond. The epilogue is spoken by the Beloved. It is his closing message.

It declares the unwavering character of his love; nothing can quench it—not many waters, not rivers. Love such as this is immortal. It is love divine, which excels all love. And she who cherishes it is made thereby one with the Beloved. The last three lines are scarcely to be paralleled in all the Old Testament. The sentiment is such as can only be developed where God's love dominates. With God, it is true that nothing has value apart from love:

Though men should give  
All the wealth of their house for love,  
They would be despicable to him.

It now is incumbent upon us to follow out the structure of the poem which has such a remarkable prologue and such a remarkable epilogue. It is divided into two parts, each of which closes with a question. The first part closes with these words (iii, 6):

Who is this  
Coming up from the wilderness,  
Like pillars of smoke,  
Perfumed with myrrh and frankincense  
Above all the perfumes of the merchant?

The closing of the second part (viii, 5) bears a striking resemblance to that of part first:

Who is this  
Coming up from the wilderness,  
Leaning upon her beloved?

This question, substantially closing both parts, remains unanswered. If it were ever answered the answer has not been recorded. There can scarcely be a mistake in this division, since the two portions are constructed alike, the second part only inverting the order of the first. Parallelism is at the basis of the plan of the poem.

There is a peculiar adjuration in the poem which appears four times. It is not throughout identical in the several appearances, except in the first two; but the first two lines are invariable:

I adjure you,  
O daughters of Jerusalem.

The meaning of this adjuration, especially in its first two ap-

pearances, is a matter of great difference of opinion between scholars; yet it serves to give us the author's plan in his poem. It appears twice in the first part, and twice in the second. And it is a most remarkable and significant fact that the contexts in which it appears are essentially similar in the two parts. The order of the contexts in the first part, however, is inverted in the second. These facts we will now proceed to indicate. In chap. ii, 7, we read :

I adjure you,  
O daughters of Jerusalem,  
By the roes and the hinds of the field,  
To awaken and to arouse  
Love until it delights.

If we inquire what purpose these four lines serve we find our clew in the three preceding lines, which are :

Because I pined for love,  
His left hand was beneath my head,  
And his right hand embraced me.

These last two lines are found without change in chap. viii, 3, where they are followed by a variation of the adjuration, thus :

I adjure you,  
O daughters of Jerusalem,  
To awaken and to arouse  
Love until it delights.

The peculiar and similar use of these verses in the two places can scarcely be accidental, even though no other confirmation of their serving the author's purpose were possible. In chap. iii, 5, we find the second appearance of the adjuration in the first part. The form is identical with its first appearance. These words are found immediately preceding :

I sought him whom my soul loveth,  
I sought him and found him not.  
The watchmen found me,  
Those going about the city.

If, now, we turn to chap. v, 8, we will find the adjuration in the following form :

I adjure you,  
O daughters of Jerusalem,  
If ye find my beloved,  
To show to him  
That I travail in love.

It is not in the scope of this article to discuss the significance of the variation in form of the adjuration as it appears here. We are concerned merely with the words which here precede it. These words are :

I sought him, but found him not ;  
I called him, but he answered not.  
The watchmen found me,  
Those who go about the city.

The likenesses, as well as differences, between this occurrence and that in chap. iii, 4, 5, will strike one immediately. The following inferences from these two may be fairly drawn : (1) that in both the author purposed to direct attention to a similar pursuit, the search after the Beloved ; (2) that the watchmen were friendly in the one instance and hostile in the other ; (3) that in the one case the Beloved was soon found, but that in the other the search was prolonged. Having indicated the essential likenesses in the circumstances introducing the occurrences of this adjuration in part first and part second respectively, we may reasonably conclude that, to the author's mind, there was a great similarity in the conditions existing and events celebrated in each part. But the order in the two parts is different.

We may now gather up into a compact statement the results obtained from a consideration of the various uses of this adjuration. In part first, she who loves and pines for love hears the voice of her Beloved. The adjuration is introduced first between the expression of consuming desire for the Beloved and the hearing of his voice, bidding her to "come away." She who loves obeys his voice and leaves and seeks and finds ; and then is introduced the second adjuration. Turning now to part second, we find her who loves seeking her Beloved and finding him not, and the victim of cruel treatment while engaged in her search. At this point the adjuration is introduced for the first time in part second. At last he is found ; and then, not the Beloved, but she who loves, gives the invitation and says, "Come, my Beloved, let us go forth." It is evident, therefore, that the author regards the contexts in which he places these adjurations as of vital importance, and that there is a sort of parallelism between the occurrences in part first and those in part second.

The author has employed a singular couplet twice, once in each part; and he indicates by the lines another feature in his Song which he desires especially to emphasize and to hold before our attention. This couplet is:

While the day breathes,  
And the shadows flee away.

We find these two lines in chaps. ii, 17, and iv, 6. They are associated in the first part with a declaration of mutual and devoted love made by her who loves. She says:

My Beloved is mine,  
And I am his;  
Who shepherds among the lilies,  
While the day breathes,  
And the shadows flee away.

In this way the author tells us, in the first part of his poem, of a time of completest devotion; but there follows a time when the Beloved departed. This is near the close of the first part. Almost at the opening of the second part we find the second appearance of the couplet:

While the day breathes,  
And the shadows flee away,  
I will go to the mountain of myrrh  
And to the hill of frankincense.

But this is spoken by the Beloved himself; and after this assertion of union and communion there follows a departure, not of the lover, but of her who loves. It is evident that the author has in mind two periods, distinct, yet with many important resemblances.

We now present our analysis of the poem. As was stated earlier in this article, we regard the principals in the poem to be Jehovah and his chosen people. The analysis is as follows:

PART FIRST, CHAPS. I-III, 6. A POETIC REVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE  
TO THEIR ESTABLISHMENT IN THE LAND OF PROMISE.

Prologue, chap. i, 2-4. A confession on the part of the people of Jehovah's call, guidance, and establishment of them.

First recitative, chap. i, 5-6.

First dialogue, chap. i, 7-11.

Second recitative, chap. i, 12-14.

Second dialogue, chaps. i, 15-ii, 3.

Third recitative, including the call of the Lover, chap. ii, 4-15.

Fourth recitative, including the obedience of the loved one, chaps. ii, 16-iii, 6.

PART SECOND, CHAPS. III, 7-VIII, 7. A POETIC REVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE FROM THEIR ESTABLISHMENT TO THEIR CAPTIVITY AND RETURN.

First recitative, chaps. iii, 7-v, 1, including the joy of the Lover in his loved one.

First dialogue, chap. v, 2, 3.

Second recitative, including the inquiry after the Beloved, chap. v, 4-8.

Second dialogue, chaps. v, 9-vi, 13.

Third recitative, an utterance of the Beloved, chaps. vi, 13 (last two sentences) to vii, 9.

Fourth recitative, an utterance of the loved one, chaps. vii, 10-viii, 5 (first sentence).

Epilogue, confession by the Lover of attachment to the loved one, chap. viii, 5-7.

It is now incumbent upon us to indicate other writings in Scripture where there is a resemblance to this mode of portraying the peculiar bond of love which united Jehovah and his chosen people. There are two singular prophecies in Hosea which are examples of an earlier use of an imagery similar to that found in this poem. The first example to which we refer is in the third chapter of Hosea. Here the prophet marries a strange woman, and, after her faithlessness, accords to her a kind and unexpected treatment, restoring her at last to wifehood. She is made to represent the chosen people; and the prophet's course is representative of Jehovah's treatment of Israel in her backsliding and sin. This example is very brief. The other is found in the second chapter of Hosea. Here the chosen people is regarded as Jehovah's loved one; yet she leaves him and seeks other lovers. It is prophesied how Jehovah will discipline her, until she returns and says, "My Husband!" If part of the history of the peculiar people is presented under the imagery of conjugal affection, it cannot surprise us that, later, the whole of their history, until the return from exile, should be given under the imagery of a lover and his loved one. Such a presentation is made in the Song of Songs.

There are two examples in the later literature which we should keep in mind as we study this exquisite poem. The twenty-third psalm is one. Canticles is replete with the thought of the lover in the character of a shepherd. His shepherding care stands out most signally. The language is witness to a joy so fresh and ecstatic that one is carried away by its sweet ex-

travagance. On the contrary, there is a quiet calm in the twenty-third psalm, resulting partly from the occasion which gave it birth. But we see mirrored in briefest epitome the whole of Canticles in the words, "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want." The second example is found in the series of three psalms beginning with the one hundred and fourth. In them is a majestic review of Jehovah's dealing with the children of Israel from the beginning. It is reflective, rather than emotional, in its language; it is an argumentative, rather than an idyllic, expression of his care and love. Yet it confirms our statement that the history of this people in regard to their relations with Jehovah was a favorite theme with writers before and after the captivity and exile.

Our study has convinced us that the Song of Songs is a production of the exile. It is a joy-song, throbbing everywhere with enthusiastic love. It is a song of the Beloved and his love; and the Beloved is Jehovah, and his loved one his chosen people. Herein rests the poem's dignity and beauty and charm. Its every description glows with the choicest words of the Hebrew language. It is, besides, one of the most symmetrical and artistic pieces of writing in Scripture. Its characters do not constitute a complicated group of personages; there are no strained dramatic situations; it is recitative or dialogical throughout. Love is its theme, but it is a love divine. It may have suggested to Paul the phrase "in the Beloved" (Eph. i, 6), and to John the definition that God is love. And it will aid the inquiring heart to understand that great mystery—the love of God for us.

*W. W. Martin*



## EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS.

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

A NEAR relative of John G. Whittier wrote an article on future probation, which was in part as follows :

Neither the theory of probation after death, now prominently advocated, nor the final condemnation of honest and good heathen from whom the outward knowledge of Christ and his salvation has been withheld, appears to be supported by Scripture. Accepting the declaration of the apostle Paul, that "the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men," and that of Peter, when he said, "God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him," Friends do not consider the heathen as inevitably lost, but, rather that, in common with professing Christians, they are individually responsible for the right use of opportunities granted them, and not for those providentially denied; that they who, without the law, are a law unto themselves, showing the work of the law written in their hearts, will be judged as they are true to the measure of light bestowed; and that they who are faithful in the occupancy of their one talent or privilege, no less than they who have been favored with five talents, will hear at last the gracious words of their Lord, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Holding these views, Friends have never felt in their mission work the embarrassment experienced by the missionary Robert Hume, who states that he found his service among the heathen in India seriously obstructed and his usefulness impaired while teaching in accordance with the doctrine that all their ancestors who had died in heathenism were subjects of everlasting punishment. From Friends' standpoint it is very easy to perceive that this difficulty in the heathen mind would be satisfactorily met by presenting to them the biblical revelation of the Father as a God of love, mercy, and justice, who deals with them as with us, rewarding their obedience and punishing their disobedience. This would furnish a strong incentive to their acceptance of the Gospel, and open to the blessings of Christianity the door of many hearts which might be closed against much of the present teaching. And this doctrine by no means operates to "cut the nerve of missionary effort" on the part of Christians.

The author of the above extract, who was as intimately conversant as anyone with Whittier's literary and religious thoughts, wrote in 1887 to Josiah W. Leeds: "As to the personal views of which thee speaks, Whittier read and approved my little article on 'Future Probation,' remarking that he was glad I felt like reviving what he conceived to be the view of Friends upon the subject. With his strong revulsion of feeling from the old, hard Calvin-

ism of New England, it is not much to be wondered at if his writings may almost seem tending to the opposite extreme; but I am confident he would advocate nothing which he regarded as conflicting with the belief of Friends and the teachings of the Scriptures."

---

#### LEADERS AND PROPHETS.

SOME leaders are such by express selection, their own or that of their fellows; others are such without selection, and nobody seems to know, least of all themselves, that they are filling the office. Of the first class Mr. McAllister, in New York, and Mr. Worth, in Paris, have recently passed away. The worlds they led concern only small minorities of mankind and minor interests of life. A Worth costume or a McAllister social recognition could be dispensed with without detriment to character, opportunity, culture, or health; they concerned nothing essential. And yet what a real empire fashion and society may become! The leader is always present in them, though frequently unknown. Why, for example, are our hats of one shape this year and of another the next? The styles in women's gowns are not changed of themselves or by any conventions assembled to consider them. On the contrary, conventions break down in the struggle to modify the decrees of an invisible leadership.

It is easy to say there are no leaders, because we cannot name them. Easy it also is to conjecture that certain tendencies run of themselves a certain course. The gown sleeve grows to a certain size, and then declines to simplicity. But it is likelier that some skilled leaders preside invisibly over the development. For it is the nature of all successful leadership to lead where followers wish to go. The other kind of leader, who drives where men do not wish to go, is not a leader. He may be something vastly better—a prophet, for example. Wendell Phillips had prophetic fire, but he led nothing. And, since leaders merely head processions of men moving whither they wish, we are apt to say there are no leaders or that the leader is merely the first man in the line.

Were George Washington and Abraham Lincoln leaders? Surely they were. An easy proof is that the people followed Washington and Lincoln, and did not follow others. But neither professed that office, and each had a score or more of associates who were confident that they themselves were leading the people. Leading men against their wishes is impossible; and leading as they wish seems not to be a high office. But the

seeming is false. There is a higher office—that of illumination. But when leadership has come to be required the hour of illumination is finished. The people must act upon the light they have received and the purposes it has shaped. To lead now requires a large mind, capable of perceiving, in a mass of tendencies, the one which masters all the rest. It requires a tactful mind, because every man thinks well of his own choice of means; and the leader must select again the favorite or preferred method. This kind of selection goes on daily. New choices of means must be made at every turn of road; and the leader must select the one which will be accepted by all. If he once chooses wrongly he may have no chance to revise his record. Lincoln made many mistakes; but his bad choices were never his own—they were what people wanted at the moment. Each new choice of means provoked opposition, but was generally approved; so that the mistakes were not his. On the other hand, look at a long procession of leaders in New York politics. One might name a half dozen who have long held the office of leadership in Lincoln's way. But the great majority of these political leaders—and all the brilliant ones—have had a short tenure of office, and have ended by trying to lead where their followers refused to go. Say that they became prophets, rising to the higher office, and nothing is changed—they failed as leaders by refusing to go the people's way.

In politics every orator and every editor is certain that he knows just what the people want. In fact, they must be nearly all wrong, because they differ vociferously. Sometimes, we suspect, nobody knows what the people want; and at such times a great leader helps to formulate desires and combine tendencies. These are the greatest leaders, and examples need not be given. Doubtless prophet and leader were combined in Moses. Perhaps, though it is not certain, a few other men have combined the two offices. Mainly, the two are not in the same relations to their public. The prophet's theme is what we ought to do. The leader's theme is the best way to reach what we want. Prophets are leaders for a day. Elijah led the slaughter of the priests of Baal. But next day Jezebel was in full possession of a power before which Elijah fled. Savonarola led for a brief season; but a worse state came upon Florence afterward. Prophets are usually poor leaders, perhaps because mankind will not be led contrary to character, impulse, and tendencies longer than through some enthusiastic hour.

If we desire leadership for any purpose—and we are always wanting it for many purposes—we want a man capable of finding out what can be done here and now, the character, history, and affections of the people being such as they actually are. He must also be able to suggest a method which the people will accept. Above all, he must not be a “boss”—that is to say, a dictator. The road to extinction lies through bossism. If one reads that a leader has imposed his will upon a body of followers—required them to do what they wish not to do—it may be taken as a resignation of his office.

Trying to follow prophets may take us to Horeb. Some reforms are gaining but slowly, because prophets are leading. For example, might not an advance march in temperance be made if a good leader should arise to study out just what an effectual majority of the temperance people will ardently support? The notion that something less than a full round “ought” may be wisest, because that less will command majorities, was very distasteful to all the prophets of Lincoln’s time. The prophets poured out their impatient wrath upon him. He was only a leader; but he brought us through our Red Sea. The prophets have long led the temperance columns; but to what great and abiding victories? We do not despair. We live in hope, we continue in prayer. The one thing lacking appears to be a leadership which can unify the forces and bring them solidly to battle. It will come.

---

#### HUMAN SOCIETY AS IT WAS, IS, AND SHALL BE.

HUMAN society, we are assured, began—in intimate fellowship with the Creator, and with a clear possibility of indefinite increase—in the persons of Adam and Eve, the created social dual-unit. In the development of its powers moral and physical evils have played a mischievous and malignant part, attempting to thwart the gracious purpose of that Power, “from which all things proceed and by which all things are upheld,” in whose presence the last analysis of science leaves us. Good and evil, desperately contending, are apparent in the conditions and movements of human society under all its phases. Rapidly increasing in numbers, it rapidly differentiates in industrial pursuits. Agriculturists and shepherds exchange their respective products. Artisans and mechanics multiply. The symphonies of ideal association are rudely voiced by those who “handle the harp and organ.” Naval architectural skill is evidenced by the building

of the ark, which bears the eight parents of all succeeding generations; and reason and capacity for concerted action are demonstrated in its construction. Worship, in conformity to the divinely revealed will, consists in bloody sacrifice. Therein the worshipers confess their consciousness of corruption, their desire for holiness, and their trust in God's mercy. The worship brings peace, purity, and moral power to every spiritual and truthful suppliant. It lays in families, clans, tribes, states, and nations of kaleidoscopic changefulness the foundations of permanent and advancing civilization.

Portions of society, as before, so since, the deluge, yield to in-born evil and become materialistic, sensual, and militant. Crime is socially centrifugal, segregative, and brutalizing. It forces into fierce and endless struggle with wild beasts and wilder men for the means of existence. It estops social progress. Not in these degraded and wretched beings—as prejudiced scientists rashly conclude—are the beginnings of modern society found. Not from the rude weapons and implements of savages have developed the marvelous machineries which convert the world into one vast workshop, wherein all the forces of nature submissively toil to supply social wants. Not from the grotesque ghost theories and ancestor worship described by Herbert Spencer have sprung the great religious faiths of the heathen, much more the system of biblical revealed religion, which is in essential concord with all the facts of the universe. In biblical light the historical connection of the whole with events in the forfeited paradise is clear. Selfishness has ever been in conflict with altruism; and in correspondence with its prevalence or decline has been the littleness or greatness, the woefulness or welfare of the people. Discontent, it is true, is the mother of improvement, rivalry the condition of progress, stress and strain the safeguard against degeneration. Perfect happiness is not of this life; but in the true striving for it is the potency of all that is best in life and the promise of that which is perfect in the future. The track of humanity in its march through time is checkered by cloud and fire and tempest. It is strewn with the wreck of peoples, races, and civilizations in which the truths of revelation had been willfully obscured, and living embodiment of them almost wholly absent. Where these are not communities perish; where they are is found the survival of the strongest and fittest.

How to hold fast that which is good and to augment the holding is the principal thought of all who wisely love themselves.

It is the spring of judicious exertion. It creates appetite that cannot be satisfied by worldly contents as they are, that longs for the heavenly bliss. It inspires and fixes the conviction that the interest of the self is the interest of the not-self, and that the well-being of all is the safety of each. Self-loving, not selfish, it is the chief factor in a socialism scriptural but not Saint Simonian, co-operative, and wholly beneficent. Churches, theologies, literature, receiving with intelligent obedience their religion and ethics from the God and Father of all, have found in them the practical solution of all social problems. Nor have these been ultrarational, much less irrational, in application of them. He who is immanent in all things while transcending all things, who guides the stars in their courses and qualifies microbes for their mission, may certainly be expected to guide beings created in his own likeness to their designed end.

Human society as it is now, in the family, Church, corporation, State, and in international relations, is as vast an improvement over what existed in the days of the Christ and his apostles as that was over the tribal groups, small or large, in which militancy was chronic, sensuality shameless, and good morals nearly extinct. Such communities are sadly numerous in many sections of the globe to-day. They need the light and power which raised Greece to the zenith of polite civilization, Rome to the mastership of the world, and Judea to supremacy in religion and morals. They need that glorious Gospel of the divine love, through Jesus of Nazareth, which has invested human life with priceless worth, inculcated reverence for the individual as the temple of the Holy Ghost, and taught the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and equality of rights under divine and human law; that Gospel which broke the shackles of slavery, mitigated the horrors of war, abolished the inhumanities of the arena, prohibited infanticide, disenthralled womanhood, and made the wife and mother the beloved companion of her husband and the guide of her children; that Gospel which has sapped the foundations of the feudal system, stricken caste with paralysis, incited to emigration, built up new nationalities in the world's waste places, and crowned the American republic with the glorious gift of government of, by, and for the people. Evangelical beliefs are the source and strength of all beneficent modifications.

Yet complaints are rife in best governed and most prosperous society that its arrangements and conditions are faulty, corrupt, narrow, illogical. And the truth in these complaints must be con-



ceded. Neither singly nor collectively is man perfect in character or adjustment to circumstance. If there were no hope of better things on this planet the late Professor Huxley said that he "should hail the advent of some kindly comet which would sweep the whole affair away as a desirable consummation." Yet some of the spokesmen of science would aggravate the miseries, real or alleged, of this sorrowful world by destroying its religious beliefs, without offering, or having to offer, any of their own. Macaulay's contrast between the England of 1685 and the England of 1853 reveals the indebtedness of his native land to the Protestant faith, and to that faith particularly as wrought into active energy by the apostolic ministry of the Wesleys and their Methodist itinerants. Since then applied science has revolutionized industry, yoked steam and electricity to improved machinery, developed commerce, drawn the race into closer touch by railways, telegraphs, and telephones, and supplied a larger measure of the value to mankind of the spirit and ethics of the Lord Jesus Christ. "The social question is at bottom a religious question." Christ is to be in reality more and more the light and life of the world. His rule is unalterably grounded in the reason of things. Who doubts that, if his two great commandments—the Golden Rule, and the new commandment—"As I have loved you, that ye also love one another"—entered into society as the soul enters into the body, society would enjoy peace and blessing of millennial quality? Stress and strain would still be in that life. Rivalry in all good words and works would be there—a rivalry in which would be utmost freedom and a sincere rejoicing when others exceed our noblest achievements, because of the glory that accrues to the Master and the good that comes upon men.

Human society as it shall be may, in some true measure, be conjectured from what of melioration has been already wrought out in its spirit, principles, and characteristics. With iridescent, oriental eloquence the prophets labored to portray what they foresaw. In statesmanly, philosophic, matchless style our Lord spoke of his kingdom—of its spirit, its truth, its power, its triumphs, its imperial consummation. Paul looked forward with faith unconquerable to the gathering together "in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth," of which he wrote to the Ephesian and other churches. And religious beliefs, harmonious with most reasonable and spiritual interpretations of "God's word written," recognizing the unity in diversity of all created things, appreciating the importance of the moral law, and



instinct with the Holy Spirit's energy, will continue to be the evolutionary forces of society. They ignore national and racial boundaries, bind differentiated units into one grand whole by means of deep and pure affection, and crown our Saviour Lord of all. They make loyal, loving, incorruptible patriots; effective philanthropists; altruists who sacrifice individual welfare in the present for the welfare of others, flood the depths of want with boundless charities, infuse sensitive sympathy with the sufferings of friends and strangers, proffer equal rights to those who need, hold surplus of wealth for those who lack, and raise self-loving, as well as altruistic, feeling to the highest degree of efficiency. The poor and the toilers are in vastly better state at the close than at the commencement of the century. And still they are not contented. Neither are the rich—the very rich, perhaps, least of all. Nor ought any to be content with earthly good and passing environment. The true conviction deepens that nothing but God and heaven can fill an immortal soul. Social evolution is distinctively religious in character. "The age must ever grow more and more religious," differentiating into more positive individualities, yet united into one composite Christian personality "distinct as the billows, but one as the sea," to be ideally perfected at the resurrection in the new heavens and earth in which dwelleth righteousness.

---

#### ABOUT READING.

WHILE reading is one of the oldest of the arts and, it may be thought, one of the simplest, it is, nevertheless, so closely intertwined with every part of present-day life, and contains such profound possibilities of good or ill, that no topic can at any time be more timely, none more worthy of careful consideration. It has been often treated; yet the last word has by no means been said, nor ever will be, since each revolving month brings some changed conditions, and each individual critic views the situation from a slightly different point of view. Only as all the conditions are grasped and all the view points combined can complete wisdom be gained.

If we were asked to state the most marked features of the years now passing, so far as concerns this theme, we should name the dominance of the newspaper and the novel, the cheapness of standard literature, and the growth of free public libraries. This last encouraging sign of the times is not yet by any

means so widely and strongly in evidence as might be wished; but in the more advanced sections of the country few towns are now without this means of diffusing culture, and handsome library buildings, either the gift of private munificence or provided by an enlightened public policy, appear on every hand. We are glad to note also the extending custom of connecting the public libraries in various ways with the public school system, so that these large collections of books, controlled by specially trained managers, may be made subsidiary to the instruction of the millions, very much in the same way as the libraries of universities are to the instruction of the few. Indeed, the public schools themselves in very many cases now have libraries under their own roofs, and the teachers make much of this additional means of wholesome training. All of which is very cheering, and bodes well for the growth of intelligence in the rising generation.

It is also an excellent thing that good books can be bought at such very low figures. No one who is raised at all above the lowest dregs of poverty need, in these days, be without a library of his own—a library which shall contain some of the choice treasures of literature and in whose presence he can “hold high converse with the mighty dead.” For a dime, or even a nickel, he may absorb the thoughts of the greatest men that have blessed the ages. No one can now complain that the means of education are beyond his reach. He may be debarred from elegant bindings and from the ripest results of modern research; but a plentiful supply of healthful mental food is easily accessible, and he may revel in intellectual riches that once only wealth could procure.

Both these items are gratifying. But can we look with equal satisfaction on the enormous increase of influence which recent years have given to the novel and the newspaper? There are, to be sure, some very evident drawbacks. There is too much reading of newspapers. It may, indeed, be claimed that the masses who confine themselves to this daily diet have tastes for only this, and would not read at all were this denied them. Granting this, and granting also that many who begin thus at the bottom acquire a taste for something higher and are thus led on to literature, we are still disposed to think that there is far too much dependence on this diluted, if not tainted, food among great numbers who are really capable of better things. It is a temptation much too readily yielded to.

We the more deplore the marked ascendancy of newspaper influence in the popular mind of to-day, because that influence, from a religious or even a moral standpoint, is very seriously polluted. To say nothing now of the mendacious and mischievous course pursued by partisan sheets in hotly contested political campaigns, whereby evil passions and narrow prejudices are sedulously fostered, two other even more damaging charges must be brought against the American press. Who does not know that, with rare exceptions, it is, on the one hand, utterly subservient to the liquor power and, on the other hand, positively antagonistic to the Lord's day. It cannot, we think, be doubted that the Sunday newspaper is one of the chief influences most actively at work in breaking down the barriers which separate the Lord's day from the secular days of the week, and so destroying an institution which is among those most essential to the best life of the nation. It will scarcely be questioned that, if the Sundays are turned into times for mere pleasure taking and money-making, our decadence as a people will be swift and terrible. But the Sunday newspaper is exactly in line with this decadence and is steadily producing it. Simply through greed of gain, and without the slightest basis of necessity, it is setting at defiance in this matter the laws of God and man. It is plainly allying itself with whatever tends to debase and destroy. For the character of the reading in the mammoth sheets (extending sometimes to forty, and even fifty, pages and containing nearly twice as much matter as the whole New Testament) is precisely such as might naturally be expected. Mr. Richard H. Dana, of Cambridge, after examining twenty-one of these papers, gathered from the ten leading cities of the Union for the purpose of reporting upon them to the Episcopal Church Congress in Boston a few months ago, expressed himself with great vigor as to the demoralizing nature of the contents. He says that after each sitting devoted to the irksome task of perusing the stuff he felt as though he needed to take a bath. Only two papers out of the twenty-one had anything like a serious bit of church reading, and this constituted only about one one-hundredth part of the paper. He bears plain testimony, as must every other candid man, to the fact that such reading as these Sunday papers supply destroys the appetite "for anything ennobling or elevating, whether in religion, in poetry, in philosophy, in biography, whether in church, or at home, or in the open air."

An even stronger indictment must be pressed against the daily

papers, because they not only fail to fight that sum of all villainies, the organized and legalized liquor power, but are, in fact, its chief bulwark, doing probably more than any other one thing to counteract the endeavors being made by godly men to rouse public sentiment against its gigantic iniquity. The press is very heavily subsidized in the interests of this irretrievably bad business. Not only are very large sums paid for advertisements, whereby the editorial pen is virtually paralyzed, but it has been substantiated by the best of evidence that, in every contest where the traffic feels itself at all imperiled, still more direct bribes are offered by it to all the leading journals, and under some form or another are generally taken. So the people are systematically hoodwinked, and the chains of the saloon are riveted afresh on the neck of a deceived public. When the newspapers of the land show such lamentable lack of principle as this, when they are willing thus to conspire with the worst of men against the true interests of the State, the real liberties of the republic, when they are ready to promote ignorance, vice, brutality, and crime merely to increase their profits, lovers of humanity and of Deity can scarcely rejoice at the power of the press. It is not a power that makes for righteousness. Newspapers should be read sparingly and skeptically, with many precautions against their mischievous tendency, and prompt, outspoken protests when they too glaringly violate good manners or good morals. They may very fairly represent a certain large section of public opinion—not the best section; but they are far from being fit to guide or mold opinion, and need constant correction by a higher standard than that which they follow.

What of the novel? No one with any brains would dream at the present day of indiscriminately denouncing all fiction. A great deal of the most beneficent literature—such as promotes appreciation of the true, the beautiful, and the good, inculcates devotion to lofty ideals, and even delineates religion in attractive guise—is thrown into story form. Very few preachers of the Gospel have accomplished as much in the pulpit as have some most earnest Christian men and woman—to name a few out of many, Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, Mrs. Elizabeth Payson Prentiss, Miss Charlotte M. Yonge, Mrs. Mulock-Craik, Mrs. Alden, Dr. George Macdonald—through the instrumentality of what, in one sense, may be called novels or fictitious narratives, and yet in reality are but artistic presentations of certain carefully selected and arranged facts of human nature. Lessons of purity, self-

sacrifice, and heroism are most skillfully taught and indelibly impressed by their volumes. Certainly, imagination is a good gift of God; and that he intended it to be employed in the instruction of the race is sufficiently evident from the parables of Scripture, as well as from *Æsop's Fables*, Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and Shakespeare's immortal dramas.

Novels, then, are allowable, and not to be excluded from the best regulated families or the most rigidly pruned Sunday school libraries. They have an important place to fill in education, enlarging at small expense one's experience of life, widening the horizon, expanding the thought, cultivating the taste. But, in order that these excellent results shall follow, great care must be exercised to read only the best. This rule is imperative. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the evil effects of devoting one's days and nights to the perusal of the trash which so largely fills the news stands. That, of course, must be entirely eschewed. But the best fiction—unexceptionable in point of literary style, animated by a high moral or religious purpose, describing, perhaps, some important phase of social progress, delineating with bright, yet accurate, colors a particular chapter in national history, teaching political truth of highest consequence, revealing choice scenes of domestic life and happy household love—can no more be shut out from any general program of selected readings than can artificially consorted dishes be banished from our tables.

Books may be divided into three classes—books of thought, whose chief use is to discipline the mind; books of knowledge, which impart information; and books of entertainment, which refresh or relax the spirit when overcharged or wearied with too close attention to affairs. Sometimes a volume will combine two of these excellences. It may impart knowledge in so skillful and pleasing a manner that it at the same time diverts; or it may do so in such a way as to involve sustained application, and hence be of service for strengthening the intellect. Similarly, in pursuit of science one may quietly stroll on a summer's day through verdant meads and bosky dells, or he may climb a mountain in the teeth of wintry winds.

There are three chief rules about reading: 1. Read with *relish*. Curiosity is as clearly the parent of attention as attention is of memory. The awakening of interest is as necessary a preliminary to good teaching as plowing is to productive sowing. Scourging the mind to an irksome task may on rare occasions be necessary and profitable, but it is not good policy to repeat it often. What

is taken in when the mind is aglow, when it has by some means acquired an eager appetite, will make a much more permanent impression than that which is placed upon a dulled palate or received from a mere sense of duty. Hence reading by topics is generally better than by authors or centuries. Well-written biographies, entertaining travels, and truthful adventures should be freely supplied to the young until they are sufficiently mature for that which is more solid and difficult.

2. Read with *reflection*. This applies somewhat even to books of entertainment, and is absolutely essential where those of the two higher classes are concerned. The mere act of reading will not be followed by lasting good, any more than the mere act of eating. What is taken into the mind must be meditated on and talked about until it becomes completely assimilated with previous stores and made one's very own. The process of transformation may and must go on until the thoughts and facts received are no longer foreign substances, but have become thoroughly incorporated with the intellectual system. Various things will help this. Notes can be taken and abstracts made. This will greatly assist review, which is of primary importance. Friendly discussion about the things read is also of great value. Nothing clarifies one's ideas and gives point to one's opinions so quickly as an endeavor to make them plain to others or to uphold them in argument against an objector.

3. Read for *results*. Results will come very largely in proportion to the clearness of the purpose and the steadiness of the aim with which the undertaking is pursued. He who works up a subject with the design of presenting it in a systematic form in an essay, a lecture, an article, a pamphlet, a book, or a debate before some association will take hold of it with a zeal otherwise unattainable, and will feel little fatigue after great labor. He has before him a definite end; and in this there is much stimulus. Random reading, on the other hand, rarely yields results, and is in most cases little better than a waste of time. It should certainly not be made the staple of one's days.

Happy the man who has learned how to eat paper and drink ink. Most happy he who has fully grasped the thought that through books he can have the range of the best company in the world. There is no society so select but he may enter it with this magic lamp. It will bring him, even from other lands and ages, those that held themselves most carefully aloof from all familiar intercourse with the common throng. These intellectual aristocrats



may be made, for a few cents, to utter in our ears their most brilliant sayings. We can have them with us when we please and as long as we like, and when we get tired of them they can be dismissed without rudeness. We can summon Plato from Greece, Cicero from Rome, Bacon, Browning, Tennyson from England, and they will come. We can drink in their wisdom, delight ourselves with their pleasantries, and be filled with their society.

The lover of books has an unfailing resource. Rainy days do not grieve him. He finds solace amid the heat of summer and the cold of winter. The loss of friends does not leave him friendless. He can make new acquaintances even in old age, and he can at any time renew his intercourse with those that were dear to him long ago. Gibbon's declaration, "My early and invincible love of reading I would not exchange for the treasures of India," has found an echo in many a breast. A few well-selected books carefully read, thoroughly chewed and digested, go far to constitute a good education. Books are the tools of those who work in the realm of mind. He who has learned how to use them to the best advantage has multiplied his power a thousandfold. Good reading—by which we do not mean elocution, but the power to get out of a book all there is in it, if not more—is almost as rare as good writing.

The day of better Christian experience in our churches will dawn when church members in general find out what an invaluable help to growth in grace is contained in devotional books. When the holiest men and women have embalmed themselves in print so that their remains have come down even to distant generations, when the distilled and concentrated extract of their thinking and living for half a century has been poured into a small, convenient phial for our daily use, when what God has taught them, as they have lain prostrate before him for many a weary night or served him in the thick of combat for many a fateful day, has been put into type and passed on to us, we show little wisdom if we are unwilling to spend some portion of our time and funds in the acquisition and enjoyment of the rich legacy. Spiritual reading is the oil which feeds the lamp of prayer. It is the mother of devout meditation, without which no character can grow solid and strong. And the high place of reading in every true life is sufficiently vindicated once for all in the great fact that it is by the study of the book of books—not the mere formal perusal, not the careless conning of chapters, not the routine, regulation recital of verses—that we become wise unto salvation.



**THE ARENA.****THE KINGDOM OF GOD.**

PLEASE permit a layman to suggest a few thoughts on the doctrine of the kingdom of God, as defined and taught by "the people called Methodists," and also by the greater part of the Christian denominations. I am led up to this writing by certain frequent utterances in our assemblies by ministers and others, who seem to regard this kingdom as a condition of the heart, utterly ignoring its future territorial and glorious aspects. Cradled in Methodism, I, of course, know what Methodists think and teach on these lines; but after many years' prayerful study of God's word I am persuaded that we do not fully understand, if we do not wholly misunderstand, the glorious truth that the Saviour would have us learn through his use of the phrase "the kingdom of God."

According to the accepted view all Christians are now in the kingdom, or the kingdom is in Christians. May I ask, then, Why did our Saviour teach us to pray, saying, "Thy kingdom come?" Does Christ expect to make no better conquest of the world than what we now see in so-called Christian lands? Is not the wealth of the world in the hands of worldly men? Were the Armenian Christians, so recently assassinated, in the kingdom of God? Were the slaughtered apostles and holy martyrs in the kingdom of God? Is such a kingdom, exposed to the bloodthirsty violence of tyrants, "the hope of our calling?" Did Jesus have no better climax of joy to offer as an encouragement to his disciples when he informed them that many should come from the east and west and should sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven? Have we not missed the true definition of the kingdom in our anxiety to have men converted and to give importance to the Church? John the Baptist preached, saying, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." He did not say it was here, but at hand. Jesus sent the twelve forth to preach the same Gospel. The twelve were not in the kingdom, neither was the kingdom in the twelve; it was a future event—"at hand." Jesus informed the apostles that they would be hated, scourged, imprisoned, and put to death. Does that look like being in the kingdom of heaven? It looks rather as if the apostles were in an enemy's land. But the Saviour promised that "he that endureth to the end shall be saved." They came out of great tribulation, not out of the kingdom of heaven—those who had on the white robes and palms in their hands, as seen by John in vision. Did not our Saviour instruct all his disciples to seek first the kingdom? But if Methodist doctrine is true the disciples had the kingdom already in their hearts. Then why seek it?

We are told that the Church, also, is the kingdom of God. This is often affirmed by scholarly writers and preachers; but the Bible nowhere calls the Church the kingdom. Two separate and distinct terms are al-

ways employed when Church and kingdom are mentioned. In the New Testament the Church is spoken of about one hundred times, but never as a kingdom. The word "kingdom" occurs about one hundred and five times, and never means the Church. The original terms are never used interchangeably. Why, then, do we presume to make them synonymous? The Church is a company of believers in the Lord Jesus Christ who are waiting for his appearing and kingdom. In the series of parables recorded in Matt. xiii concerning the kingdom all have their climax in the final result. It is a harvest, a grown tree, a leavened whole, the end of the world. All other steps were but preparatory, leading up to the grand *finale*—the kingdom of heaven. The mother of Zebedee's children had, in some respects, a proper conception of the nature of the coming kingdom when she requested of Christ that her two sons might sit, the one on his right hand and the other on his left in his kingdom. This is seen by the Saviour's reply: "To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." The baptism of blood must first precede the reign of glory.

The kingdom of God was a literal kingdom on the earth during the Jewish dispensation. The Jewish kingdom was a type of a better kingdom under Christ. It is taken from the Jews and given to a nation—mark the term "nation"—bringing forth the fruits thereof. This nation is yet to be manifested. It will be made up of men of all ranks, colors, and ages, Jew and Gentile, bond and free, learned and illiterate, rich and poor. The kingdom of God is represented by the Saviour in Matt. xxv, in the parable of the ten talents, as being simultaneous with his second advent. His appearing and kingdom are chronologically simultaneous events. The servant is now increasing his talents, if he is faithful, while the employer is traveling in a far country. The reckoning day comes apace. The "well done" is pronounced, and the servant is made a ruler. This teaches the return of our Lord and his coming kingdom. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory. . . . Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." This text shows when the kingdom comes; it is at the judgment. How then can a Christian be in the kingdom now? Christ says in another place, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." This is another text showing that the kingdom is future, and is not the Church, and is not in the hearts of believers. The so-called spiritualizing tendency of our age ignores the literal meaning of these texts and simply regards them as various forms of the same thought—the kingdom of God in our hearts! The literal sense of the Scriptures must always be held, unless the language is manifestly figurative. Prophets, angels, the Lord himself, and his apostles all teach a future kingdom.

If the kingdom of God is in our hearts, why does the apostle James ex-

hort us to patience in the presence of oppression? Are our oppressors our slayers? Peter tells us that our inheritance is reserved in heaven, ready to be revealed in the last times. He does not teach that we have it now in our hearts. Christians are exhorted to diligence in order to secure an abundant entrance into the kingdom. The kingdom is promised to them that love God. James says God hath chosen "the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him." Daniel tells of terrible persecutions of the saints; but he adds, "The Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."

"But," says one, "are we not told that the kingdom of God is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost?" Yes; these are the characteristics of the kingdom. Napoleon said that the empire was peace, meaning its policy. "But," declares another, "Christ said, 'Is not the kingdom of God within you?'" If we believe that the Pharisees whom the Saviour denounced as hypocrites had the kingdom within them, then may we have it. The proper understanding of that expression is said to be that Jesus, the King, was in their midst. I simply desire to bring the matter to the notice of our denomination for the purpose of securing better instruction in this department of our faith and doctrine.

J. DAVISON.

*Chicago, Ill.*

---

#### WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR IT?

IN some strong words by a writer in the *Literary World*, in which sincere regrets at the recent decease of certain wholesome authors are expressed, we find the following: "There is something very sad in these two, strong for righteousness in their different manners, leaving us now, when books which it is a sin and a shame to write, to publish, or to read are flooding the London book market. There have been some books published here in London this season fouler than any leprosy, and we are threatened with more of the same sort. Sin wrought in passion is evil enough, but at least it is human; but for those who in cold blood write books that will appeal to the basest part of human nature, that will corrupt innocence—for these books are published by reputable publishers and circulated by the libraries—woe to them! I would rather take for my friend a public sinner who had sinned through human frailty and passion than I would touch the hand of these purveyors of vice." These are pretty severe words of censure. Yet, in view of the obvious facts, who shall dare to extenuate the offense, which every book buyer knows, and every guardian of youth ought to know, is "rank and smells to heaven?" If the truth were spread out before us clearly it is to be greatly feared that the fortunes of some book publishers are the price of blood as really as that of any liquor dealer.

Where does the responsibility begin and end? At this rate, may not the time come when it will be safer not to know how to read? Accepting the relation of the book publisher to the book writer to be as that

of the gas company to the carboniferous deposit, is not darkness better than some gas? The tendency to monopoly and the formation of great corporations with many stockholders and subscribers results in a lessening of the sense of personal responsibility as to the methods and product of the book trade. What individual member of certain firms would like to stand at the bar of God and assume the sins of his business house? The statistics of newspaper and paper-covered literature are startling. Really, during the last thirty years the drinking habits of society seem to have improved more than the reading habits. It would be of very great interest to know where publishers draw the line as to the quality of the pabulum furnished to our youth. Have the great circulating libraries a standard of morals at all as to the books available to the public? Or do they throw the responsibility back on the author?

Here we would stop could we forget a recent case in point. In a certain large Sunday school library attention was called to an armful of accepted literature the character of which prohibited its being read in a teachers' meeting composed of both sexes. Can any higher work occupy the pastor's hands to-day than the correction of such evils?

*Saratoga, N. Y.*

HENRY M. SIMPSON.

---

#### THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

THE following remarks are not intended as an answer to, or as an argument against, others in the same line in previous "*Arenas*," but are suggested by them. Jesus Christ was both God and man, or else Bible statements bearing upon this subject are a medley of contradictions. As physical man he was of the same material with ourselves—flesh and blood. The germinal seed of his physical and sentient manhood was, however, begotten of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin; and so he, the "second man," is the "Lord from heaven." This divinely begotten manhood partook in its nature of our humanity through the period of gestation in the mother's womb, and yet was so guarded and kept by the Holy Ghost as to be prevented from moral and physical contamination. Thus Jesus Christ was and is, in his humanity, divinely human. In other words, he was, in all the essentials of manhood, a man begotten of God. The first man, Adam, "of the earth earthy," was a man created of God; the second man, Jesus Christ, was a man begotten of God. Neither of these was under any law of necessity as to sin. Each could have successfully endured the test; but the first man failed, and through him came the woe of sin upon the world, while the second Man stood the test, and through him came redemption to the race unto physical and moral life, and salvation by faith unto eternal life. In this divinely human Man "dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Thus God, the infinite and eternal One, was in Christ the divinely human Son; and thus in him we see fulfilled "the mystery of godliness"—that God "was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory."

But was this man Christ Jesus capable of sinning? In undertaking an answer to the question we must keep steadily in mind his twofold nature—the divinely human combined with the essential, indwelling Godhead. Certainly, the Godhead could not have sinned; “He cannot deny himself.” If so, then creation would continue to groan and travail in pain and anguish for the eternal ages. But faith, conjoined with revelation, says that “he abideth faithful.” And so we rest in the impeccability of the indwelling Godhead; while we are compelled to the conclusion that Jesus Christ, the divinely human Son of God and Son of man, in whom “dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily,” must have wrestled with the powers of darkness, against the temptations that beset him to sin against God the Father and to leave undone all that he came to do in the way of a world’s redemption and salvation, with a moral force and determination of purpose that had behind them the possibility of failure through a succumbing to the awful pressure that was brought to bear upon him. The soul recoils at the bare contemplation of the possibilities of the case, but finds its refuge and crown of rejoicing in the fact that he did not fail, but marched forward with the step of the mighty Conqueror that he was to the fulfillment of the work the Father gave him to do. In so doing he extorted, even from his enemies, the cry, “Truly this was the Son of God.”

With the facts before us as they are, the ground of debate is transferred from that of possibility to that of probability. That he did not sin is clearly evident, that he might have sinned being possible. Still, it was in no sense probable that God the Father could make a mistake in the choice of an agent for the accomplishment of a work of such tremendous moment as the salvation of a ruined world. From God the Father’s foreknowledge he knew that Jesus would not fail; but he must have known at the same time that, Jesus being man and thus a moral agent in a state of probation, although for a specific purpose, the possibilities of sinning were with him, as with all moral agents. If the conclusions reached are not correct, where, then, the merit of Christ’s atonement? The lambs slain on Jewish altars had no merit, however free from spot or blemish. These were but types. Types of what? Of the Lamb “slain from the foundation of the world.” Was that Lamb destitute of intellectual and moral faculties? Was he a mere machine? A moral machine, if there can be such, differs only in kind from other machines. Each does what it has to do perforce—no more, no less. Not so our Christ. As the consciousness of his mission “to seek and to save that which was lost” dawned upon him he set his mind and heart with determined purpose against all the blandishments and enticements of the world, and, treading the wine press alone, accomplished the supreme moral triumph of the ages. Thus through his merits and his atonement he made it possible for men redeemed by his own blood to enter, through faith in him, upon a career of spiritual, moral, and intellectual progress that will end only with eternity’s years.

*De Land, Fla.*

J. T. LEWTON.

**THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.****A NEGLECTED FACTOR IN CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE.**

THE age in which we live is critical. It is so hesitant to acknowledge any principles or facts as settled that it might be fitly characterized as a great interrogation point. Its constant question is not, How shall we make use of what we have? but, How shall we best prove that we are absolutely in the dark and possess no truths upon which we can safely rely? This eagerness to disprove what is generally acknowledged has with many persons become almost a passion. The success of many scholars is supposed to consist in the measure in which they have demonstrated how very uncritical our fathers were and how little their arguments and decisions can be justified to modern thought. This results from an unsettled state of thinking on religious truth in general, and has led to a rejection of all religion as too uncertain in its foundations to enter as a forceful element into the life of man. If criticism has not proceeded so far as to reject all possibility of certitude on the most important problems of life and duty and destiny it has, at least, produced an indifference which is widespread and alarming. Dr. Sanday, of Oxford University, England, under the head of "The Present Disquietude," says: "It cannot be denied that there is not a little disquietude and anxiety in the air, and that especially amongst good people. . . . They have recently become aware—more fully aware than they were before—of a considerable change of front among scholars and thoughtful men in regard, primarily, to the Old Testament, but, we might add, also to the New. And the form which this has taken is such as to excite uneasiness and apprehension."

If the effect of this were merely to produce disquietude and nothing more, if it left the "good people" with no loss of their old-time faith in the eternal verities, no loss in spiritual experience and in Christian activity, we might pause before deprecating the attitude of viewing God's word to which allusion has been made. It is apparent, however, that it means more than mere intellectual inquiry and uncertainty. It means a loss of spiritual enjoyment, and raises the question whether there is any religious experience, since there seem to be so few certitudes on which it can rest. This intellectual attitude ignores, too, the primary consciousness which grows out of faith, and counts it as of no value in estimating the historic facts out of which it springs.

The Christian experience is peculiar. There is nothing like it in the world. It has no real parallel among false religions. It is, at first view from an outside standpoint, an emotion produced by certain conditions and environments; but those who possess it know better. They realize a divine impulse, something entirely different from that which comes to them in connection with any other facts. Take, for example, the emotion which springs out of the consideration of the sacrificial death of Christ,



that which in theological language we call the atonement. A critical examination of gatherings of Christians will show that when this doctrine is presented by those whose souls are aglow there is a uniformity of results, inexplicable on any other theory than that this special truth has relation to experiences which are peculiar to itself. The mere view of Christ as a martyr does not produce the same spiritual effect. Nor does the portrayal of the sufferings of those who, in all ages, have given themselves for others produce the kind of experience now under consideration. The emotion thus excited is so unique and universal as to rule it out from the sphere of ordinary phenomena growing out of the consideration of human suffering or human sacrifice. The lives of good men, even that of the Saviour himself when considered by itself, do not produce this spiritual emotion. The conclusion, then, must be that the unique relation of Christ to humanity as the divine Sufferer, as a sacrifice for human guilt, is the source of this experience, and that the scriptural fact and statement on which it rests are thus verified as truth. The constant production of a Christian experience, growing out of the scriptural presentation of the great facts of our religion, is a proof that the statement of facts is correct. We thus arrive at the proposition that the spiritual use of God's word is of importance in ascertaining its certitude and, properly applied, will remove much of the present disquietude among Christians.

The external criticism has been carried to such lengths that the soul life which the word, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, has wrought and the evidence that grows out of it have been overlooked. The old writers on Christian evidences were accustomed to divide them into two classes, the external and the internal. The modern method ignores the latter almost entirely. Is it not time that the pulpit should recall the thoughts of our people from their constant devotion to external evidences to those deep spiritual verities which are the life and power of the Church? What the faith of the Gospel has wrought in the hearts and lives of sinful men is the final argument, from which there can be no appeal; for it is founded on the profoundest principles of our being, it rests on Him whose words are spirit and life.

---

#### DEVELOPMENT IN SERMONIC COMPOSITION.

*(Continued.)*

THE subject of development as applied to style, which we have already attempted to illustrate from the sermons of the late Dean Stanley, is enforced by the reflection that the wide diffusion of general information in the Church makes this the field best adapted for the expression of the preacher's originality. He may find it his duty to discuss facts or principles which have become commonplaces among the people; but his masterly and, perhaps, unique development of them may invest them with fresh interest. He is like the painter employing familiar objects and, by the lights and shades of his art, giving to that which he portrays a reality which the ordinary observer has never seen in them, although he has



looked upon them a thousand times. It is not expected of a preacher that he shall constantly present to his hearers novel themes. The Gospel is old and familiar, and its heart truths have been known to the people from their childhood. To neglect the eternal verities which are the life of the Church and the homely duties of life which must always be the true life of the Church would be an abandonment of some of the noblest themes of the preacher. Here, again, comes in the value of development. The ordinary duties of life may, when unfolded by a master's hand, become as fresh as if they were a new revelation.

The portrayal of human character, too, gives opportunity for skill in this direction. Much of the preacher's work is the delineation of character. The great names in the early Church are still the most interesting pulpit themes when fully appreciated and portrayed. One needs only to study the sermons of great preachers to observe how much their power for good has been increased by their ability to delineate human character. The power of some men is almost entirely the outgrowth of their skill in this particular.

I select another illustration of Dean Stanley's method of rich and unique development from his sermon on Charles Kingsley, on the text, "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong" (1 Cor. xvi, 13). "Watch—that is, 'be awake, be wakeful,' have your eyes open, the eyes of your senses, the eyes of your mind, the eyes of your conscience. Such was the wakefulness, such the vigilance, such the devouring curiosity of him whose life and conversation, as he walked among ordinary men, was often as of a walker among drowsy sleepers, as a watchful sentinel in advance of a slumbering host. The diversity of human character, the tragedies of human life were always as to him an ever-opening, unfolding book. But, perhaps, even more than to the glories and the wonders of man he was, far beyond what falls to the lot of most, alive and awake in every pore to the beauty, the marvels of nature. That contrast in the old story of 'Eyes' and 'No Eyes' was the contrast between him and common men. That eagle eye seemed to discern every shade and form of animal and vegetable life. That listening ear, like that of the hero in the fairy tale, seemed almost to catch the growing of the grass and the opening of the shell. Nature to him was a companion, speaking with a thousand voices. And nature was to him also the voice of God, the face of the Eternal and Invisible, as it can only be to those who study and love and know it." Anyone familiar with the writings of Charles Kingsley will at once recognize two things in this extract—the fitness of the text to the man and the keen portrayal of his character.

---

#### CONFERENCE EXAMINATIONS.

EDITOR ITINERANTS' CLUB: At its last session the New York East Conference appointed a committee of five of its members to prepare a plan for conducting Conference examinations and to report at the next session. The present writer had the honor to be made chairman of this

committee, and the Rev. Herbert Welch, of 455 Washington Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., was made secretary. All the members of the committee, and the chairman and secretary in particular, will be glad to receive hints and suggestions upon this matter from their brethren in any Conference, especially those Conferences which are using any advanced and progressive methods of examination. I desire to note certain defects in the system at present in use in our own and many other Conferences.

1. *Incompetent examiners.* Oftentimes men wish to be put upon examining committees for no other reason than the honor implied in such an appointment. In consequence of this, it is common to find examiners who are incompetent. It is obvious that the examiners ought in every way to command the respect of the candidates, both in regard to general scholarly attainments and to their familiarity with, and taste for, the special topics under their charge.

2. *Utter absence of proper instructions.* Under the present system a student buys or borrows his books, reads and studies them alone as best he can, and comes up to Conference without the remotest idea of the method his examiners will pursue. Only too often he finds that the examiner has an entirely different idea of a book from his own, and he makes a poor showing or an utter failure on a topic he has tried faithfully to master. Frequently the candidates would even be glad to know whether they are to have an oral or written examination.

3. *Haste in conducting examinations.* A committee has been known to examine a class on a whole year's studies in a session of about three hours. Sometimes only one question is asked each student out of a large and important book. This makes the examination something like a lottery, as an admirable student might easily fail on one question, and a very poor student might get the one thing he happened to know in all the book. But an examiner who likes to make thorough work of his subject is often urged to hurry by his fellow-examiners, who are impatiently waiting for their turn. This trouble is made worse by the nervous condition in which most candidates come to Conference. Another difficulty comes from the growing tendency to double up examinations. This occurs in the securing of earlier ordination as local preachers, and in the cases of those who avail themselves of the recent permission to theological graduates to double up their examinations.

The favorite remedy for the second and third of these defects is found in the device of the Itinerants' Club. The only objection to this is the difficulty of working it. If the examiners and candidates can be brought together in midyear and go through a part of their work, if the candidates can receive instruction in regard to the remainder, much will be gained. But the difficulties in doing this are very great. It is hard for busy men to find the time. In these days, when even Conferences are beginning to pay the board of their members, it is hard to find a place for the gathering. Perhaps it is the hardest of all for the young men, most of whom are on small salaries, to find money for the expenses of the trip.

In a general way this article represents our committee; but for any

specific thing in it, especially anything which may cause adverse criticism, only the present writer is responsible. I also wish, as not even indirectly representing any person except myself, to offer for the consideration of my brethren the following plan, hoping that its defects may be remedied and its merits brought out more clearly by their criticisms.

PLAN FOR CONDUCTING CONFERENCE EXAMINATIONS.

I. 1. There shall be a general examining board, consisting of twenty-four members of the Conference and elected by it. After the first election these examiners shall be divided into four classes, to serve respectively for one, two, three, and four years. As the term of each class expires the Conference shall elect six members to serve for four years, and shall fill vacancies reported at any session of the Conference. The board itself shall have power to fill any vacancy in the membership when necessary to arrange for examinations held before the Conference meets. This board shall have charge of the examinations of all candidates for membership or orders, both traveling and local, except that examinations not in the English language shall be assigned to special committees. If a candidate has passed satisfactorily in any study he shall be excused from examination in that study if it occurs again in another course which he also pursues.

2. The board shall choose a president and secretary from its members, and shall divide all its examinations into departments, assigning enough members to each department to properly care for its work. In making such assignments they shall consider taste and abilities for special work.

3. When an examiner knows the candidates for examination in his department it shall be his duty, during the year, to give them some information in regard to his views of any books in the department and the way in which they should be studied in preparing for the examination.

4. The president of the board shall generally superintend the work of dividing the board into departments and the method of conducting the examinations. The secretary shall keep an accurate record of the examinations and the standing of candidates. The president and secretary are, however, to be examiners in at least one study.

II. 1. The regular examinations shall be held at the session of the Conference, and every candidate shall at that time be examined in at least one half the studies of his year.

2. When any candidate wishes to be examined in a study during the year he may arrange for a meeting with the examiner in such study, and the examiner shall report such examination to the secretary of the board for record and presentation to the Conference.

3. In case the examiner and candidate cannot arrange for a meeting the examiner may send an examination paper to some member of the Conference residing near the candidate, and the candidate may read such paper and write his answers to it in the presence of the member of the Conference, who shall then send the papers to the examiner; and he shall report the result to the secretary as before.

FRANK S. TOWNSEND.

*Waterbury, Conn.*

# ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH

## DAVID AS A PSALMIST.

OF late years unusual attention has been given to a minute study of the Psalter. Destructive criticism, having spent its force on the historical and prophetic books, has taken in hand to depress the date of this venerable collection by several centuries, so as to make every psalm, not simply post-Davidic, but post-exilic as well. Professor Robertson Smith, though, perhaps, holding that some of the psalms were written by the poet-king, yet informs us, notwithstanding the fact that tradition declares David to be closely connected with the early psalmody of Israel, that "there is little direct evidence to support this conviction." The reason for depressing the date of the Psalms is not far to seek. It is the natural outgrowth of the Pentateuchal or Hexateuchal discussion. If it can be proved that the first six books of the Old Testament were written several centuries after the Exodus, and that the advanced legislation, the complete code of morals, and the lofty tone of religious feeling pervading these books were impossible in the age of Moses or till after the time of David, it will aid materially in demonstrating that the ascription of the grandest and sublimest lyrics of the ages to David and his contemporaries is an unmistakable anachronism. "Church hymns," says Cheyne, "like our Psalms cannot be imagined even in the age of Deuteronomy"—that is, in the seventeenth century before Christ. This learned author assures us, with oracular certainty, that there are only two indubitably Davidic compositions in the entire Old Testament, namely, 2 Sam. i, 19-27; iii, 33-34. Thus, with one stroke of his mighty pen the sweet singer of Israel is unceremoniously pushed aside from Hebrew psalmody. "Putting aside," says he, "Psalm xviii and possibly lines imbedded here and there in the later psalms, the Psalter, as a whole, is post-exilic."

Cheyne, in common with many rationalistic writers, reduces the poet-king to a "man of war" occupying a low spiritual level. He was not "a Church leader, like Zoroaster;" though gifted in music, he was not a psalm writer, for David's fame, we are assured, "rested chiefly upon his secular poetry." He further assures us that neither David nor even Isaiah could have dreamed of Church hymns such as those contained in the Psalter. Then follows the modest admission that he "cannot divide sharply between the age of David and, say, of Isaiah." But, nothing daunted, he adds, "The latter is no Christian, nor is the former a heathen." Kuenen, as might be expected, also maintains that the Psalms, with their sublime teachings so full of the ethical and religious, must be post-Davidic; "for the religion of David was far below the level of the Psalter." Even Driver, perhaps the most conservative of this school, finds it difficult not to feel that many of the psalms ascribed to David "ex-

press an intensity of religious devotion, a depth of spiritual insight, and a maturity of theological reflection beyond what we expect from David or David's age." The burden of the above words is to show that whoever wrote the Psalms must have lived centuries later than David. Why? Because the Psalter presupposes the law. The Pentateuch having been already depressed until at least the time of Ezra, it is necessary to assign an equally late, if not much later, date to the Psalms. Else much of the argument relied upon to prove the late origin of the Pentateuch would be sadly weakened, if not wholly invalidated. This must not be, for it would require a reconsideration of the Pentateuchal question. The Psalter, this oldest of all hymnals, is "the response of the worshipping congregation to the demands made upon men in the law." It is the same old story. The development of literature, no less than of religion, demands a late origin for the Psalms. This radical criticism starts from false premises. Therefore, its conclusions are naturally untrustworthy. It assumes that Israel was not capable of deep communion with God till about the Babylonian captivity, or, indeed, according to the more radical, ages later. Hence the effort of Cheyne and others to assign late dates to every book in the Old Testament.

These same critics likewise unite in insisting that only a very small number of the psalms are the expression of the thoughts and prayers, the hopes and faith, the sorrows and anxieties of the individual soul. They must be regarded, rather, as the experiences of "many men and of many ages of the national life." They are the experiences, not of a separate soul here and there, but of the united Jewish Church. The individual, even though he may speak in the first person, as the "I" or "me," does so as representing or personifying the entire community of pious worshippers. Now, what is gained by this view? Our critics insist that, if it can be shown that the individual element is crowded out, then the Psalms become "national, rather than individual, and must, therefore, belong to an age in which the nation had been welded closely together, an age in which there was unity of thought and unity of aspiration. That this age did not precede the captivity is clear." Granting that the psalmist generally spoke as a representative of the community, we are utterly unable to see why this should prove the post-exilic origin of the Psalms, or how it could overthrow the Davidic origin of every psalm in the collection. It is folly to argue that David's experience was not such as to call forth the outbursts of anguish and despair, of praise and prayer, of joy and exaltation in all and every psalm bearing his name. It is equally groundless to contend that his age could not have produced such gems as the Eighth, Nineteenth, and Twenty-third Psalms. The age of David, with its struggles and trials, with its revival influences under Samuel and his co-laborers, and with its glorious triumph, was as well calculated as any period in Jewish history to call forth the highest type of religious truth, all aglow with pious fervor and religious enthusiasm. We need, therefore, not depress the date of the Psalms to the less spiritual times of Persian rule or Maccabean revolution.

Again, is it not a fact that all great writers reflect, more or less, the spirit of their times? Thus, while breathing out their loftiest sentiments, they are merely the spokesmen of the entire people. The individual is swallowed up in the nation. This is true of all literature. The beautiful hymns of Luther and Gerhardt, of Wesley and Watts, though at first the expression of the innermost thoughts and desires of these holy men, have nevertheless something in them that is exceedingly appropriate for believing souls everywhere. So of the matchless songs of David. Though written nearly three thousand years ago on the hills of Judea, they still find a ready response in the heart and innermost soul of the pious, whether on the banks of the Thames or the Congo, whether on the slopes of the Himalayas or on the steppes of Russia. This is because the wants of the human soul thirsting for communion with its Maker are the same everywhere and in all ages. Trials and privations, difficulties and persecutions, aspiration for higher life and communion with God were certainly as common in the age of David as in any age before the advent of our Saviour.

The fatal mistake of this radical school of Old Testament critics is to premise that the sentiments contained in what are generally called the Davidic psalms are of too lofty a nature for the age of David. They are unwilling to open their eyes to the recent discoveries in archæology, which prove most conclusively the advanced stage of civilization at a time long anterior to the reign of David. The monuments of Egypt prove clearly that the world in the times of Moses, yea, long before his time, enjoyed a very high degree of culture, much higher than our radical friends are willing to admit. Late discoveries have agreed in a wonderful manner with the history as given in the Old Testament. Away, then, with the idea that the Hebrew Scriptures are made up of fanciful legends, to be believed or rejected as it suits our purposes. The Old Testament takes it for granted that the Egyptian, Babylonian, and Hittite empires were very powerful in the distant past. The settlement of Egypt is lost in hoary antiquity; but, go back far as we may, we find traces and evidence of much culture among this ancient people. Says Professor Wiedemann, of the University of Bonn, in his recent treatise, *The Ancient Egyptian Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul*: "As far back as Egyptian history has been traced the people appear to have been in possession, not only of written characters, national art and institutions, but also of a complete system of religion. As in all other departments of Egyptian life and thought, so with Egyptian religion—we cannot trace its beginnings. What greatly intensifies the deep interest of Egyptian eschatology is that it testifies to the fact that a whole nation believed in the immortality of the soul four thousand years before the birth of Christ." And if the Egyptians were thus early advanced in their religious ideas, why not the Israelites?

These dwellers of the Nile valley were not a hermit nation, shut up by themselves, for it has been clearly established that there was intercourse between the valleys of the Nile and Euphrates centuries before Abraham—



and that by land and by water. And now comes fresh and additional evidence that at least three thousand years ago Egypt and India were connected, not only by an overland route, but also by sea. That trade and literature and diplomacy were in a flourishing state in many countries ages before Moses is a recognized fact. Recent discoveries prove, also, that the Egyptians especially possessed much lyric poetry used for devotion, such as litanies and praises to their gods. Some of these ancient hymns to the sun and the Nile are really excellent. Why, then, should it be thought remarkable, not to say impossible, that David, centuries later, might have written the finest and loftiest of the psalms? Are we to utterly disregard the universal tradition which makes David the father of Hebrew psalmody? How could the ancient Hebrew Church have fallen into error on such a point? Though we may grant that some psalms ascribed to David were not written by him, but belong to a later age, it does not follow that the inscriptions of the entire collection must therefore be rejected, or that David is not the author of a single psalm. That many of these inscriptions are as old as the text itself cannot be doubted. Their great antiquity is attested by the fact that they were unintelligible when the Septuagint translation was made.

It is far too common nowadays, in the discussion of biblical questions, to lose sight entirely of the doctrine of inspiration. It is a cardinal mistake to try to account for the superiority of the Bible to the sacred writings of other nations without seeing the guiding hand of Jehovah in its production. If we view the writings of Moses and David in this light, if we grasp the idea that they are the inspired word of God, we shall then have no trouble in comprehending their advanced teachings and ethical superiority. Our fathers regarded the Scriptures in a more sacred way than we do. It may be they went too far; but are not we in danger of taking too low an estimate of their worth? The unrest along the line of biblical criticism arises largely from the effort of our rationalistic writers to eliminate the supernatural and prophetic from the book. They insist, and there is a fascination about it, that the Bible should be treated exactly like other sacred books. It would be unjust to claim that all who say that David did not write any of the psalms utterly disregard the supernatural in the Bible. It is, however, a fact that the majority of these minimize the supernatural element as much as possible. And, if they do at all believe in the inspiration of the word, they do so in a very limited degree.

But why make all the psalms post-exilic? Why deny the Davidic authorship of the majority of psalms in the first book on purely subjective grounds? What reason have we for ascribing such spirituality to writers of the Maccabean age? Why transfer the golden age of Hebrew psalmody from the age of David to that of Judas the Maccabee? These are some of the questions that every young man should answer fully before abandoning the view still held by most of the evangelical theologians and devout biblical scholars of England and America, and before accepting the theories of radical critics.



## MISSIONARY REVIEW.

## RIGHTS OF FOREIGN RESIDENCE AND TITLES IN CHINA.

A PETITION is in circulation, addressed to the President and Senate of the United States, relative to the ill-defined and unsatisfactory status of the civil rights of missionaries in China under existing treaties. There are many citizens of the United States in China, holding property to the value of many hundreds of thousands of dollars, who reside in the interior of the empire; but their residence and their title to property are not guaranteed by any explicit technical phrase in the treaties, though it is believed that the constructive right to both has been established. This constructive right is maintained under a clause in the French treaty, inserted in the French text, but not found in the Chinese text. By an understanding between the two powers, however, the French has been declared to be the official text. Under the "most favored nation" clause of other treaties this has been asserted to apply to the missionaries of other nationalities and to their property, as well as to the French; but the Chinese government has claimed the right to interpret it for itself. The government has just sanctioned the right of native churches or native Christian societies to hold property, after having pigeonholed the matter for thirty years. But property which belongs to a native church is no longer owned by the foreigners who furnished the money to the native church. The Chinese government has thus interpreted through local officials. If the property be confiscated there is no means of redress. Public sentiment is readily inflamed against Christians in China, thus preventing the operation of ordinary Chinese justice. The Chinese government has interpreted the right of property as subject to *feng-shui*, a species of necromancy about which the people are fanatical and whimsical. It has, besides, interpreted this property right as subject to the pleasure and approval of local Chinese officials, without which the legal title cannot be consummated. This is obstructive and prohibitory, practically forbidding landlords and middlemen to sell property to missionaries.

The petitioners pray for such modifications of existing treaties as will render unquestionable the rights of missionaries to reside in the interior, and for the removal of unjust conditions and restrictions imposed by the Chinese government which practically destroy already conceded rights of property and acknowledged privileges of residence. Another distinct subject named in this petition is that of inflammatory publications against Christianity and Christians. These are widely circulated books and placards, which are not regularly authorized by the government, but are published by high officials connected with it, and in the eyes of the people have all the weight and authority of government publications. They contain foul calumnies against Christianity and against foreigners, charging them with such practices as the tearing out of human eyes in order to

manufacture specific medicines, the kidnapping and mutilation of children, the dishonoring of women, as well as other practices too obscene or too revolting to describe in print. The riots which have endangered the lives and property of American citizens have been traced to these inflammatory publications, which have been scattered over the whole empire, especially throughout the Yang-tse valley. These publications are sold at government bookstores. It seems a delicate task to interfere with a free press in another country or to dictate the suppression of literature current in the land, even if semiofficially issued by the government; yet the political bearings of this, as affecting international peace, justify the demand. The missionaries say that a policy like that outlined in this petition would mean an immense gain for the cause of Christ in China, would be a decided blow at the murderous riots of the past few years, would advance friendly relations with the people and open doors to a multitude of places, even to whole provinces, now sealed against missionary effort.

---

#### THE ISSUE IN JAPAN.

THE issue in Japan between Christianity and the other religious systems may be said to be fairly joined. It is true that the opposition to Christianity assumes the form of nationalism; but this nationalism includes the defense of existing institutions, such as idol worship and concubinage, which find their base in the native religious systems. Yet it must be remembered that this contention does not involve more than one in seven of the total population of the empire. Outside of this fraction the people are either totally uninformed of the new conditions or wholly indifferent to them. This one seventh, however, constitutes a molding and energetic leadership, though they are not yet sufficiently advanced to know the impracticability of the task they have set themselves—that of placing Japan in the front rank of civilized peoples and, at the same time, prescribing as a test of loyalty to the emperor the duty of preserving religious institutions.

The nation as a whole has thrown religion overboard as a State institution; but the upper one seventh are more or less dominated by priests who are never neglectful of their own interests. The Buddhist priests during two years past have exhibited an increasing bitterness to all progress which in its roots involves a modification of Buddhism. Though the progressive and the nonprogressive wings of Buddhists are at outs with each other, they are at one in their organized antagonism to Christianity, and are influencing Shintoists to cooperate with them in a national resistance of it. This they seek to accomplish through political channels. The Buddhist priests number nearly one to every four hundred and twenty of the population, and those of the Shintoists about as many more. Hence there is an ever-present and highly organized force, in the ratio of nearly one to every two hundred men, women, and children in the empire, officially interested in influencing the rest to conserve the existing centuries-old religions. This force includes many of the most popular orators and

most powerful writers of the nation. It is become the order of the day to promote "revivals" of the old faiths as against "Western creeds." Funeral rites fallen into disuse are restored and temples repaired. The loyalty of native Christians is challenged by a professor in an imperial university, and thousands of tracts are circulated against Christians, stigmatizing them as unpatriotic. This has driven the Christians into an effort to produce an indigenous formula of Christianity which has created distrust in Christian Churches at home. This attempt at a "Japanned" Christianity has weakened support from abroad. The Japanese Christians seem to be desirous to expel the foreign missionary as the only alternative to the expulsion of Christianity itself. The methods of the Christian mission are imitated by the priests at the same time that they are feared, and because they are feared. One Buddhist school says in its circular that the girls' schools of the missions are established for the purpose of spreading Christianity, that they are, therefore, unsuitable to the country, and that schools for the education of women should be established on Buddhist principles. These Buddhist schools have a five years' course, in which English is taught if desired; but particular attention is given to knitting, sewing, ceremonies and amenities of social life, domestic arts, and Buddhist ethics.

Thus not only may religion in Japan be said to be in a transition daze, but national peculiarities must be reckoned with in all attempted reformations, revivals, or substitutions which look to religious progress. There can be but two alternatives, so far as the native religions are concerned. Either national progress must be checked or Buddhism and Shintoism must be left to their natural fate. Patience will be demanded on the part of both Japanese and Western Christians in this transition. Each must make the effort to put themselves in the place of the other. Mutual respect, thoughtful consideration, and possibly concessions on both sides will be demanded. Haste is to be deplored. The Christianity of Japan is being cradled in the bosom of a revolution, which will never go backward. The American Board has sent a strong commission to represent it at the council board of its affiliated churches in Japan and to consider the present exigency with, if we are correctly informed, power to materially modify its direct administration. The Methodist Episcopal Church annually sends what in other organizations would be named an official "deputation" to study and help to guide in this crisis. God has a mission for this island empire, which is now a factor in the future development of Asia.

---

#### THE WORK OF GOD IN EAST CENTRAL AFRICA.

THE missionaries of Great Britain in east Central Africa are making history with phenomenal rapidity. The Church of England missionaries in Uganda, over a year ago, received an enlargement of spiritual perception and what they esteemed as a baptism of the Holy Ghost for service, as never before. This was extended to the native Church in a series of

special services, organized in the hope that it also might be indued with power from on high. The effect was surprisingly immediate and decisive. It was an out-and-out revival of religion, as the vernacular of our home Churches would phrase it, in its best sense; a phenomenon for which the secular world has no nomenclature; a sort of religious cyclone which distinctly supernatural influences are recognized as alone competent to produce. Secular historians pass these by, as though they were not at all factors in the development of society; yet they are radical elements, as formative and masterful as any forces besides.

The immediate result of this special outpouring of the Holy Ghost on foreign and native workers was a thousand baptisms within the year following. The expansion was, within the year, from twenty country churches to two hundred, with an average seating capacity of a hundred and fifty persons, while the ten largest combined would hold forty-five hundred. In these churches on Sunday there now assemble twenty thousand souls to hear the Gospel; and on week days the attendance is not less than four thousand. These figures are not inclusive of the capital, being only for the country districts. And this is only the beginning of an enormous extension in the country. The churches are themselves, in eighty-five stations, supporting one hundred and thirty-one teachers. Of these stations twenty are outside of Uganda proper in adjacent districts; and the native missionaries supplying these twenty stations are thus "foreign" missionaries sent by the Uganda Christians to the regions beyond. At Bu'si, an island near Jungo, fifteen miles south of Mengo, two thousand people are under instruction.

All attribute this movement to a Bible foundation. The Scriptures have been distributed broadcast over all this territory, and the people not only read them with avidity, having paid for them that they might own them, but devoutly study them. It is the assertion of Archdeacon Walker himself that it is no uncommon thing for a man mending a fence or a woman hoeing a field to ask if the Herod mentioned in a certain passage was Antipas or Agrippa. One missionary asks the Church at home what they are to do if a hundred thousand copies of the New Testament shall be required in the course of the next two or three years, and a million reading sheets besides. That would require fifteen hundred man-loads to be brought from the coast, and it would be well-nigh impossible to obtain so large a force when other traffic is steadily demanding more carriers. These people will do days' work to purchase the Scriptures. One missionary says he has fifteen men "working for books," and adds, "To see the rush when the sale of the New Testaments we brought up began was a sight not to be forgotten." The "change of heart," of character, and of life wrought by the Holy Ghost in these natives of Uganda can only be accounted for by the heathen around them by supposing that at baptism an incision is made in the head and a powerful medicine rubbed in which kills the old heart, and that there then comes in its place a "new religious heart which does not lust for anything." The apologetic element of such a movement must not be overlooked.

**FOREIGN OUTLOOK.****SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.**

**Professor Dr. Adolph Julicher.** In New Testament criticism he holds a middle position between those who adhere to tradition, in spite of critical evidence, and those extreme critics who venture to penetrate into the innermost secrets of ancient literary production. He is an exponent of that growing class of German critics who see plainly that the attempt to explain every least point leads to the wildest confusion, and who are anxious to see criticism follow more sober methods hereafter. This is not because he or they whom he represents are afraid of any truth which may be discovered. They merely recognize the fact that there are limits to the knowable in the origin of documents—that, while conjecture may be admissible, conjecture cannot, in most cases, be lifted to the dignity of fact. Among the opinions which he holds relative to New Testament problems may be mentioned the following: Even as early as Justin Martyr, the term "Scripture" was consciously employed to include the gospels and the Apocalypse. The only Pauline epistles which he confidently denies to Paul are the pastoral epistles. These he places about the year 125 A. D. He regards the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians and the Epistle to the Colossians as probably genuine. Even the Epistle to the Ephesians may possibly be genuine. He decidedly opposes the hypothesis of the composite character of Second Corinthians and Philipians. In his treatment of the Apocalypse he is very cautious. He holds it to be a book by a Christian of about 95 A. D., but thinks that in several parts older apocalyptic elements were embodied. Whether these are from one or from several apocalypses, or whether they are of Christian or of Jewish origin, he cannot decide, and thinks the question may possibly never be decided. In the criticism of the gospels he holds to the hypothesis of a double source; but, instead of the usual theory of a primitive Mark, he regards our canonical Mark as the source of our canonical Matthew and Luke. As to the Acts of the Apostles, he makes the "we" source very extensive, declaring that the author of the Acts probably derived all that is valuable concerning Paul from that source. He is inclined to attribute the first half of the Acts to oral, rather than to written, sources. But the speeches of the first half are thought to be inventions of the author.

**Professor Dr. Hermann Schultz.** In these days when our ideas of apologetics are undergoing so radical a change, it may be well to hear what so great a dogmatician has to say. He firmly believes that, although faith is a personal and practical religious conviction, and although we cannot spread religious truths in the same way as those of logic and mathematics, yet there is a possibility of a true science of apologetics. It can be shown that true science does not compel the abandonment of the religious view of the world, and that a harmonious understanding of the

world, including man as a moral and reasonable being, is impossible without this religious conception, but is furnished by it. The task of apologetics is to understand the nature and justification of religion, to comprehend the historical manifestations of religion, and to show the nature and perfection of Christianity. This latter, he thinks, can be sufficiently demonstrated. Whoever accepts the Christian faith does so because his soul, unsatisfied with itself and the world, experiences in the person of Christ the reality of the good and the consciousness of peace. But it is necessary to the thinking Christian to give himself a reason for claiming that the Christian religion is not only the best among many religions, but the best possible religion. For this purpose it is necessary to appeal to the decisive principle of religion. The proof of the perfection of Christianity is found, first, in the character of the benefits derived from the person of Christ, and, secondly, in the manner in which God reveals himself to man. Both of these are such as to preclude the possibility of anything higher. He is of the opinion that the materialistic and the pessimistic view of the world will alike forever fail to satisfy the demands of the human heart, and hence that they can never replace the religious faith. He believes that the task of defending the reasonableness of the Christian view must fall more and more to public address. If this be correct it is time that the preachers should study with more care the true line for apologetics to pursue and prepare themselves to present it to the people.

---

**Paul Natorp.** The question of the relation of religion to human progress, while settled for the vast majority, is an open one for a sufficiently large portion of mankind to give it profound importance. There are those who give due credit to religion as a factor in the early development of the race, and yet believe that after a given stage has been reached progress can only be made by the complete abolition of religion. Others there are who think that the race will only reach its highest goal in the full realization of the religious ideal. To say nothing of the opinions of the masses, even among thinkers the latter view has by far the majority in its favor. According to the judgment of Natorp religion is an essential element of human nature, and there can be no true world-wide human society and no common universal progress without it. He avoids the extreme, on the one hand, of those who regard religion, both as to its source and purpose, far above all questions of human interest and, on the other, of those who regard humanity as so elevated that it is impossible to connect with it so intangible, uncertain, and subjective a thing as religion, concerning which they hesitate whether to call it an innocent or a consciously guilty self-deception. Natorp thinks that humanity can be and ought to be, not divided, but united, by means of religion. He is a believer in the doctrine of original righteousness, according to which the most decided characteristic of a human being is his need of fellowship with God, without which he can never reach his highest development or happiness. He opposes decidedly the attempt to produce or teach a



system of morals disconnected with religion. On the other hand, he demands the giving up of the universal requirement of belief in specific dogmas as inconsistent with Christian freedom. This leads directly to the idea of religious instruction, which is to be based upon broad Christian, as distinct from denominational, interpretation. Whether this can be practically wrought out remains to be seen. It can certainly be done as soon as Christians are predominantly Christian, rather than sectarian.

---

#### RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

**Die Beziehungen des Papstthums zum Frankischen Staats- und Kirchenrecht unter den Karolingern** (The Relations of the Papacy to Frankish Civil and Canon Law under the Carolingians). By Dr. Richard Weyl. As never before, the history of the development of the papacy is being studied, greatly to the detriment of its pretensions. We can do nothing here but give some of the principal results of Weyl's most carefully conducted investigations. The close relationship which sprang up after a long period between the papacy and the Frankish kingdom, and which was brought about by the missionary activity of Bonifacius, was in consequence of prudential considerations on both sides. But the popes were not able to secure any decided influence upon the civil law. Especially were the popes not allowed to exercise any authority in the enthronement of kings or emperors. More influential, however, were the popes in respect of ecclesiastical law. The pope was universally regarded as the highest authority in dogmatic questions. He was regarded as the chief defender of the faith and first preacher of Christian doctrine, and as such had a number of rights, none of which, however, gave him any power over the civil authorities. The pope had no participation in the establishment of bishoprics or in the filling of the sees, although in the matter of archbishoprics he was granted a certain right of participation. When Italy became a part of the Frankish empire the pope was reduced to the position of a mere bishop, coordinate with the other bishops of the empire and, like them, subject to the supervision of the State and the limitations placed upon the episcopate by the civil authority. Even in matters of faith the authority of the pope suffered a diminution, the king and the clergy repeatedly taking a position in opposition to him. The general conclusion from all this is that under the Carolingians, as under the Merovingians, the pope was never recognized as having a primacy—that is, as a hierarchical power ruling the clergy; while the rights granted to the pope were neither numerous nor especially important. These are weighty, but they are wholly justified, conclusions. The next struggle with the papacy will be along the lines of its history, and it will be well for our people to know the facts in the case.

---

**Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII** (Publication in Age of Gregory VII). By Professor Dr. Carl Mirbt. Sometimes a work should



be noticed merely because it is a sort of cyclopedia on the subject of which it treats, altogether apart from any views to which it may give expression. Of this sort is the work now mentioned. For one who would understand the literature of the years 1031-1112 A. D. it will henceforth be indispensable. An idea of the comprehensiveness of the material included may be had by the following list of topics of the eight sections: the controversial documents, their date, occasion, authorship, etc.; the measures of Gregory VII against Henry IV; the celibacy of the priests, and simony; the sacraments of the simonistic and married clergy; lay investiture; the relation of the State and the Church; Pope Gregory VII; character and significance of the entire literature. The particularity of the study may be seen by a brief statement of some of the results of the first section: The whole number of documents is one hundred and fifteen, the number of authors sixty-five. Italy produced forty-eight documents and twenty-seven authors; Germany, fifty five and twenty-seven, respectively; France, eleven and ten; while only one other country was represented, namely, Spain, with one. Many of the documents were anonymous or pseudonymous. The authors and those to whom the documents were addressed were clergy and monks, with two exceptions. Fully half of the documents were written by bishops, of whom two thirds belonged to Italy. Only about a dozen monks are among the authors, but they furnish some of the most important writings. The Gregorians produced sixty-five pieces, their opponents fifty. It is impossible to go further into details. But no one can read this work without obtaining a clear idea of the questions at issue, the arguments by which each side supported its positions, the aggressions of the papacy, the growth of public opinion, the literary power, the general condition of the Church, and the state of civilization. The period covered is one of the most interesting in history, and here we have material for its detailed study. We again express the wish that such investigations might be more frequent in English.

---

**Individual- und Gemeindepſalmen—Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des Psalters** (Personal and General Psalms—Contributions to the Expositions of the Psalter). By Dr. Georg Beer. The first part demonstrates, from the superscriptions and other indications, that in its general character the Psalter was a collection of songs for public worship. Nevertheless it is pointed out that the Psalter became a book which was employed by individual Israelites for purposes of private worship, and that, although a great number of the psalms were evidently written for public use, yet there are others which argue against the idea of a liturgical use and which were unquestionably written for private worship, being later adjusted to the congregation. Beer accounts for the origin of the Psalter as follows: First there was a David-psalter, comprising Psalms iii-xli; this was followed by a later David-psalter, comprising Psalms li-lxxii, subsequently enlarged by a Qorah-psalter of Psalms xlii-xlix, and an Asaph-psalter of Psalms l, lxxiii-lxxxiii, and a still later appendix of Psalms lxxxiv-lxxxix. To these two were added a collection, mostly anonymous, of Psalms xc-cl. As an in-

roduction to the whole collection Psalms i and ii were prefixed. The whole collection was completed about 140 B. C. In examining the time of the composition of the particular psalms he begins with books iv and v, which, he thinks, reveal the warlike period of the Maccabees and the end of the Greek period, with the certainty that none of the psalms of these books originated earlier than the end of the Persian period. Especially, the Qorah and Asaph psalms, of the second and third books, exhibit a period of misfortune for Israel. Some of these songs point plainly to the end of the Persian period; others fall in the period subsequent to Alexander the Great. The songs of the first book belong for the most part to the Persian and Greek periods. The only psalms which, according to Beer, belong to an earlier period are iii, iv, xi, xviii, and the indications of their earlier date are not thoroughly convincing. This shuts David out altogether from the composition of the Psalms. Beer thinks, however, that David was a religious poet, basing his opinion upon Amos vi, 5. Some critics have trained their faculties so perfectly that they can, apparently, hear the grass grow.

---

#### RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL.

**The Growing Estrangement of the Masses from the Protestant Church in Germany.** It is a fact which cannot be gotten rid of by mere denial that such an estrangement is taking place, or, one might almost say, has taken place. It would be matter for rejoicing if one could put it wholly in the past. But unfortunately it is still in progress, partly because the minority who have remained more or less faithful to the Church are losing one by one their sense of loyalty, partly because those who have long been estranged are being confirmed in their indifference. One of the first things to do, ordinarily, is to lay all the blame for such a state of affairs on the Church—to say that if the Church had done its duty, or had been what it ought to have been, the masses would have been true to it, and only occasionally would one have turned away. Doubtless the German Church has its share of blame. It has based its work upon a doctrinal, rather than upon a practical, foundation. This has caused it to spend its strength in the definition of the truth instead of upon its practice. Only the few, even among the clergy, have been able to participate with vigor in the one absorbing object which the Church should keep in view. The masses of the people have passively received what the few offered them of an intellectual kind. There was nothing for the laity in general to do except to join in the ritual observances of the Sunday services according to the prescribed forms. Being based upon doctrine, the Church has contented itself with catechetical instruction followed by confirmation, and has trusted to the sound reason of those thus received into the Church to keep them true to the teachings thus provided. That the opposition of the natural heart to the requirements of the Gospel could be overcome in the way adopted by the Church was not doubted. The enthusiasm of personal experience has been quenched by the same cause. If the principal thing

is sound doctrine, then no provision need be made for the production or maintenance of experience. Prayer meetings are almost unknown. To speak of one's experience is regarded as fanatical. The same theory it was which permitted the parishes to become so large. Small parishes, with a pastor to look after each member personally, are not needed where the basis of Church membership is doctrinal. This also it was which led to the neglect of the practical duties of the Christian life, which, however, are rapidly coming to the front in the ideals of the Church. Besides this doctrinal cause another has worked powerfully to the same end; it is the German national trait of abhorrence of innovations. It prevented Pietism from doing what it might otherwise have done for the German Church, and it has made progress among the "sects" very slow, much to the detriment of the cause of God among the Germans. For had the sects become a greater power than they are they would have reacted favorably on the Established Church, both by liberalizing it and provoking it to good works. But, admitting the validity of all this, it still remains true that the Church is not chiefly to blame for the present state of affairs. None of the preachers of the world have ever been able to win the masses and hold them permanently. None of the apostles, nor even Jesus, could do it. Nor has the Church in any age been able to accomplish this work. Humanity at large is too fickle to be constant in its loyalty to Christ. The demands of the Church, even when they are at the minimum, are higher than men generally are willing to submit themselves to for any considerable length of time. But the principal cause outside of the Church, which, in addition to the constant factors working in opposition to its success, now hinders the people from firm adherence to the cause of Christ, is the growing sense of the temporal claims of men. In other words, the political and economical situation is such as to emphasize the earthly to the exclusion of the heavenly, the material to the subversion of the spiritual. We have science instead of philosophy, skill instead of culture—everything pointing to the betterment of human temporalities. These things by themselves would not have produced the effect. But, combined with the fact that the Church must of necessity look toward spiritualities and has by oversight failed to give due attention to the temporal welfare of the people, it has contributed more than anything else to the results so much to be deplored.

---

**Religious Freedom in Russia.** Upon the ascension of Nicholas II to the throne of Russia a new and more liberal era for that country was prophesied. All appearances did, indeed, seem to indicate that the long-wished-for time was about to dawn when perfect religious freedom should be secured for the hitherto oppressed Jews and other religionists. But these hopes were doomed to bitter disappointment. The Jewish persecutions continue, and there is to-day less prospect that they will cease than ever. The latest form of oppression is one of incredible cruelty. The Russian health resorts are crowded, especially in the summer months, with people of all classes, who desire the benefits which the health-giving

waters confer. It is now ordered that in the southern part of Russia, in the Ciscaucasian province, all Jews shall be forbidden to summer at these resorts, whether they be there in search of health or of pleasure. That such a thing should be possible in a Christian country in this age of the world should elicit a storm of indignation sufficient to awaken the Russian authorities to a sense of their crime.

---

**The International Union of Friends of Young Girls.** This excellent organization has not received the attention it deserves. It is but seventeen years since this form of benevolent work was first agitated. To Frau Aine Humbert, of Neuchâtel, Switzerland, belongs the honor of beginning the work. The members of the order pledge themselves to assist unprotected young girls who are obliged to go out into the world, and to protect them from the dangers which beset them in the larger and smaller cities. In Neuchâtel there is a bureau whose function it is to assist these girls in finding work and homes, and which places about one hundred annually. Similar bureaus in Lausanne and Vevay find places each for from one hundred and twenty to one hundred and fifty annually, so that in the past ten years about three thousand girls have been provided with homes or work in French Switzerland alone. About ten thousand girls in various lands have been cared for during a longer or shorter period of time. The union numbers many thousand members in Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Portugal, Russia, Sweden, and North America. A number of periodicals keep the members in touch with each other. The official organ of the International Union is published in Neuchâtel, under the name *Le Journal des Bien Public*, on the 15th of each month, and gives information of the work everywhere.

---

**The Berlin Depot Mission.** Of the same kind as the above is this work. It has been proved that, of the 34,587 young girls who during the last year entered Berlin for the purpose of finding employment, a large number fell into bad hands before they left the depots. The Association for the Protection of Female Youth, therefore, provided for the prevention of this state of things in the future. Volunteers from among the women of the association serve in turn at the various depots. They wear a badge on the arm by which any young girl entering the city can recognize them. By word and deed they assist all girls who apply to them. The Minister of Public Works has arranged that suitable space be given for the accommodation of the agents of the association, and the police president has ordered the depot police to give them every possible assistance. The association has made arrangements by which the six provinces especially contributing young girls to the servant class of Berlin shall be made acquainted with the provision for girls arriving in Berlin.

---

**A Protestant Episcopal Bishop for Spain.** Archbishop Plunket, of Dublin, together with the Bishop of Clogher and Down, recently ordained

54—FIFTH SERIES, VOL. XI.

a Protestant bishop of Spain, the ordination taking place in Madrid. This act has called forth much comment in English High Church circles and aroused much opposition. The principal reason for the opposition is that the existence of a Protestant bishop in Spain is an attack on the rights of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in that country. Such consideration for Roman Catholicism, founded upon such a reason, is the clearest possible proof of the essential harmony between High Church Episcopalianism and Roman Catholicism. It means that if the episcopacy be of the same type all other differences sink out of sight. The High Church Englishman sees no use for a reformation in Spain, because Spain, as well as England, has the "historic episcopate." Nevertheless, the Protestants of Spain received this token of favor from Protestant England with great satisfaction.

---

**The German Huguenot Association.** This historically interesting organization held its latest meeting in Maulbronn, which is the center of the Württemberg Waldensian colony. Members were present from all parts of Germany, Holland, Italy, and Spain. The meeting was more truly international than any previously held. At Maulbronn is an old Cistercian cloister, where, in the Summer Church, the opening festival was held consisting of sermons by Drs. Klotz, Braun, Correvon, and Burk. The president of the association read his report on the second day, showing that there was growth in every department of their work—ecclesiastical, literary, and benevolent. Addresses were delivered on topics relating to the workers, the work, and the history of the Waldenses.

---

**Postal Savings Banks in England.** According to the last annual report of the postmaster-general of England, 983,189 persons paid into postal savings banks during the past fiscal year the sum of \$123,245,120, or an average of about \$125 each. The total sum held on deposit by the postal department is \$407,938,205. Of the interest on these deposits \$8,300,520 were not drawn, but left to be added to the deposits already made. The number of depositors in all Great Britain is 5,748,239, of whom 220,117 are Scotch, 235,944 Irish, and the remaining 5,292,178 English, every sixth Englishman being a depositor. Great efforts are being made to encourage children in the public schools to save and deposit their money, even in the smallest amounts, and apparently with good effect.

---

**Female Inspectors for German Factory Girls.** The League of German Women's Clubs, which met in March of last year, recently handed a petition to the ministers of commerce in the individual states composing the empire, looking toward the installment of female inspectors in factories where large numbers of females are employed. According to the report of the inspectors for 1892 there were in that year 223,538 female laborers ranging in age from sixteen to twenty-one years, and 337,499 over twenty-one years of age, not to mention 72,692 girls less than eighteen years old. These figures reveal the demand for such a measure as that proposed.

## SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

ROUGH and toilsome is the author's path to fame. Whoever cherishes the delusion that it is a smooth journey will be undeceived by such an article as "A Reply to My Critics," which Dr. Max Nordau writes in the *August Century*. Says this author of *Degeneration*: "Since my book left the press it is literally true that not a day has passed without bringing down upon me a shower of printed calumnies." Some of his critics, he says, have called him "a lunatic;" some have asserted that he himself does not believe a single word of what he has written; some have insinuated that he possesses no qualifications for writing such a book as *Degeneration*; some have found "the most flagrant evidences of idiocy" in his works. But "the most astounding performance," says Nordau, "is that of a Berlin physician who has devoted an entire book" to him and who regales him in the first half of it with "the whole vocabulary of opprobrious epithets which is to be found in the German language." These critics, however, Nordau brushes aside with the caustic rejoinder that some "are incompetent, some dishonest, and some both." He then seriously devotes his attention to "the few objections which have been advanced in good faith by competent judges against the fundamental principles" of his book. To the claim that history shows there have been frequent epochs when "a kind of epidemic insanity" has taken possession of the race, he shows the distinction between the "spiritual epidemics" of the past and that of the present; and asserts that the existing hysteria and degeneration are on the point of dominating art and literature. To another criticism, that an author's characters do not necessarily represent his own opinions and purposes, Nordau answers at length that it is not "illegitimate to draw conclusions from an author's work to the author himself." And the third objection, that all genius is a form of degeneration, he declares erroneous. The reader will enjoy the vigor of Nordau's rejoinder. He fights like a gladiator.

*Christian Literature* for July opens with a discriminating article by Leonard Woolsey Bacon, which he entitles "Concerning the Use of Fagots at Geneva." It was nearly three hundred and fifty years ago, he reminds us, that Servetus, "one of the first physicians of that time and one of the greatest scholars of an age of great scholars, was brought out from the prison in which he had been shivering with cold and devoured by vermin, and led into the presence of the magistrates of Geneva" to receive his sentence of death at the stake. But Dr. Bacon has no new word to speak for John Calvin, in his relation to the martyrdom of Servetus. To defend him, he writes, "for his course towards Servetus is no longer possible, in the light of the full array of evidence now accessible to every scholar," which position he fortifies by quotations from



Roget, the syndie Calandrini, and others.—In the August number of the same periodical is a translation of four interesting letters from John Huss to his church in Prague, and a letter from fifty-seven lords and gentlemen to the Council at Constance. These five famous letters are found in the complete edition of Luther's works. The translator is Dr. M. J. Cramer.

THE opening article in the *North American* for August is by W. J. H. Traynor, President of the American Protective Association. He writes on "The Menace of Romanism" in vigorous phrase. The papacy, he asserts, "seeks to renew in the New World the power of which she has been denuded in the Old," and his organization "will continue its work until popes have learned that under the American Constitution, as it now stands, they have no right that is not possessed by the most insignificant member of the nonpapal clergy or laity." The next article, on "Female Criminals," by Major Arthur Griffiths, her majesty's inspector of prisons, catalogues the evil deeds of various woman murderers and poisoners. Andrew Lang writes entertainingly on "Tendencies in Fiction." The Rev. Dr. H. Pereira Mendes follows with an article on "The Solution of War." Arbitration in his estimate being the best method for abolishing strife, and an arbitratative power being necessary which is above suspicion, Palestine must be restored to the Hebrew nation and there be instituted "a world's court of arbitration." "Its environment will be the temple, dedicated to the Father of all; and over its members will be the halo of religion." In "The Yacht as a Naval Auxiliary" the Hon. William McAdoo, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, shows the value of this vessel, and holds that the "eager and enthusiastic yachting spirit now abroad in our land bodes well, not only for the navy, but for the merchant marine." Sir Benjamin Ward Richardson gives some wholesome advice in "What to Avoid in Cycling." The transition "from depression toward prosperity," as seen in the comparison of 1894 with 1895, is the gist of "The Turning of the Tide," by Worthington C. Ford, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics at Washington. The Right Honorable Sir Charles W. Dilke writes briefly on "The New Administration in England." In an article entitled "Leo XIII and the Social Question," the Rev. J. A. Zahm concludes that the present pontiff, "because he was obedient to the laws of history and because he understood the social needs of his time," deserves to be forever known as "the pope of the workingmen and the great high priest of our century." A continuation of the interesting historical reminiscences of Albert D. Vandam is found in his "Personal History of the Second Empire—VIII. Prosperity and Social Splendor." Professor Goldwin closes the list of contributions with a suggestive article on "Guesses at the Riddle of Existence," which is really a critique on the recent works of Kidd, Drummond, and Balfour.

THE *Presbyterian Quarterly* for July contains, as its contributed articles: 1. "Primeval Man," by F. R. Beattie, D.D.; 2. "Ratramn and



the Transubstantiation Controversy," by Dunlop Moore, D.D.; 3. "Anselm," by L. G. Barbour, D.D.; 4. "Young People's Societies and our Church," by E. Brantly; 5. "Kidd's Social Evolution," by G. S. Patton, A.M. The conclusion of Dr. Beattie in the first article is that the candid reader will give a verdict against "primeval savagism." It will be found that "man was not a rude savage or a wild barbarian, but that his genealogy is correctly given in the Scriptures, which assert that Seth was the son of Adam, and that Adam was the son of God." The fourth article vigorously protests against young people's societies as now existing in the Presbyterian Church. The objections are that the movement is subversive of the parental rights and destroys the family unit; that the movement is congregational and episcopal, such organizations being "not safe, at least, for the Presbyterian Church;" and that doctrinally there is danger in the Christian Endeavor Society's teachings. The strong intrenchment of the writer in his theological stronghold is shown by his warning that "all this machinery is merely the methods suited to the Armenian system of theology, woven together in one new and imposing piece of mechanism, which cannot but be hurtful to a pure Calvinism."

---

In the *Edinburgh Review* for July the first article, discussing the "Royal Commission on Trade Depression," specifies the qualities of industry and thrift as a mitigation for the evils of bad times. The third article reviews the life of Sir William Petty, who is known in England as "a founder of the Royal Society, as the father of statistical research, as one of those adventurers in the domain of experimental science who made the close of the seventeenth century famous." "Many of his qualities," says the reviewer, "have been inherited by the house of Lansdowne, especially his sound judgment and political insight." In the fourth article, on "Materials for the Study of Variation," the views of William Bateson are discussed, whose position is that natural selection "can never be the cause of the origin of species, which must rather be due to spontaneous variations upon which it may act." In "The Collected Works of Robert Louis Stevenson," the writer sums up his judgment of the late novelist in the following characterization: "Deliberate analysis confirms us in the belief that Stevenson owed much of his fame to the personal liking of his contemporaries; nor can we discover either novelty or profundity in his social philosophy."

---

In the *Lutheran Quarterly* for July an historical article on "A Proposal to Have the Lutheran Bishops of Denmark Consecrate Bishops for the Episcopal Churches in America" opens an interesting chapter in the ecclesiastical history of 1785 and thereabouts. The Rev. J. K. Hilty writes in this number on "Proportionate and Systematic Giving;" Dr. J. W. Schwartz on "Does Natural Religion Reveal Only One God?" and the Rev. G. C. Henry, in the novel form of a letter read before the Des Moines Ministerial Association, on "A Better Minister."

THE *Nineteenth Century* for July has: 1. "Cromwell's Statue," by Algeron Charles Swinburne; 2. "The Conservative Programme of Social Reform," by Sir John Gorst, M. P.; 3. "The Irish Fiasco," by Henry Jephson; 4. "An Object Lesson in 'Payment of Members,'" by Major General Tulloch; 5. "Intellectual Detachment," by Sir Herbert Maxwell; 6. "Dr. Pusey and Bishop Wilberforce," by R. G. Wilberforce; 7. "My Native Salmon River," by Archibald Forbes; 8. "Recent Science," by Prince Kropotkin; 9. "How to Obtain a School of English Opera," by J. F. Rowbotham; 10. "The Church in Wales," by the Lord Bishop of St. Asaph; 11. "Color—Music," by William Schooling; 12. "Religion in Elementary Schools—Proposals for Peace," by G. A. Spottiswoode; 13. "The Society of Comparative Legislation," by Sir Courtenay Ilbert; 14. "A Moslem View of Abdul Hamid and the Powers," by Rafiuddin Ahmad; 15. "Some Lessons from Kiel," by W. Laird Clowes.

---

*Our Day* for August has a portrait and a character sketch of Tolstoi. H. S. McCowan writes on "The School of the Kingdom," and Harris Weinstock asks, "Are We Becoming Socialists?"—The *Canadian Methodist Review* for July–August has articles by Dr. W. Jackson, on "The Nature of Christ's Atonement;" by W. J. Hunter, D.D., on "Body and Soul—a Theory;" by Rev. W. M. Patton, on "Progressive Revelation—a Review;" and by Rev. John Reynolds, on "The Teaching of Christ," etc. The Rev. John Maclean contributes a sermon on "The Ministry of Pain."—The opening article in the August number of the *Chautauquan* is on "Santa Barbara Floral Festivals," by Miss S. A. Higgins. It is illustrated.—In the *Missionary Review* for August Dr. A. T. Pierson writes of "An Apocalyptic Crisis in Papal History." An illustrated article by J. H. Laurie, D.D., on "Missionary Work in the New Hebrides," will also be found especially attractive.—The *Catholic World* for August has a most seasonable article on "Better than a Trip to Europe." It is written by H. H. Neville, is attractively illustrated, and describes in an entertaining way the enjoyment of travel through the great West.—The *Methodist Magazine* for August opens with an illustrated article by Dr. W. H. Withrow, entitled "In the Levant." Professor A. P. Coleman writes on "Canoeing on the Columbia," and Lucy W. Brooking tells "The Story of Ashanti." Both of these articles are plentifully illustrated. Mark Guy Pearse writes on "Christianity and the Poor," and Hugh Price Hughes on "Christianity and Women."—The *Quarterly Review of the United Brethren* for July has articles by Bishop J. W. Hott, on "A Free and Liberal Church;" by President C. M. Brooke, on "Our Educational System;" by the Rev. F. P. Rosselot, on "Orthodoxy;" by Mary L. Marot, B.S., on "The Religious Conceptions of the Author of Isaiah xl–lxvi;" by Dr. J. G. Johnston, on "Harmony of Science and the Bible;" and by Rev. E. H. Caylor, on "Spiritualism—Its Fact and Fraud." Dr. H. A. Thompson also contributes a memorial article on "John Wesley Etter, D.D.," which is accompanied by a portrait.

## BOOK NOTICES.

## RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL.

*The Foundations of Belief.* Being Notes Introductory to the Study of Theology. By the Right Hon. ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR, Author of *A Defense of Philosophic Doubt*, etc. 12mo, pp. 366. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Price, cloth, \$2.

A year ago Kidd's *Social Evolution* was the new book most talked about, one authority declaring it the most important since Darwin's *Origin of Species*, issued in 1869. Now, and for six months past, Balfour's *Foundations of Belief* fills the immediate foreground of serious literature, being called by some the most remarkable religious book since Professor Seeley's *Ecce Homo*. Such estimates are sometimes not careful and exact, but merely flags and signals of individual opinion flung to the wind in the excitement of first impressions and while under the immediate spell of the book in hand. Few, if any, can stand close under the shadow of one book and make a fair and just comparison offhand between it and other books. To get the true perspective and be able rightly to compare proportions and values the mind must stand off from them all, doing some walking back and forth, approaching and receding along a line equidistant from the things to be compared. Few human utterances are so little certain of being in the form of sound words as are the impulsive opinions ejaculated over a new book. Have we not all suffered in our feelings, and also in our finances, because of this? Do we not owe amiable grudges to various well-meaning persons whom it was our misfortune to meet at the fateful moment when they were full of bursting with some new book and bubbling over with enthusiasm about it, and who so imposed their fine frenzy on our ignorance, thirsting for knowledge, that we went in haste to buy the book as if it were a passport to Paradise? We vaguely expected it to reconstruct us, solve our problems, show us how to reform the world, and lead us and our fellows into new hemispheres and larger horizons. To obtain it we parted with our precious ducats, dear to us almost as are the ruddy drops that visit our now sad, because experienced, hearts. And every time we see or think of that volume we feel, however it was bound, as if we ourselves were naturally bound in sheepskin or had been "lams" in Wall Street. If we were capable of learning from experience most of us have had enough to prevent us from believing from year to year that the latest book out is the greatest ever written. It must be a poor book that the author or the publishers cannot induce somebody to praise beyond its merits. What we here write is largely self-admonishment, and in no degree indicative of a disposition to disparage Mr. Balfour's book, which we now hasten to say possesses unusual power, significance, and momentum. Of this a considerably impressive proof is seen in the fact that it has immediately evoked a discussion quite extraordinary in volume, in quality, and in the caliber and standing of the

participants. The chief thinkers on all sides of theological belief have been unable to let this book alone. In *The Nineteenth Century* Dr. James Martineau has reviewed and commended it for its keen ability, while criticising mildly some of its forms and methods; and in the same magazine Professor Huxley attempted to repel Balfour's vigorous assault upon agnosticism. In *The Contemporary Review* Principal Fairbairn, of Oxford, discusses the book, and in part dissents from it; says that, while brilliant and fascinating, it is disappointing, and that its underlying philosophy is weak. In *The Fortnightly Review* Professor W. Wallace, of the department of moral philosophy in Oxford, makes a labored attempt to vindicate rationalism, naturalism, and transcendental idealism against Balfour's sharp criticism. One excellent saying of Professor Wallace is: "If God is hard for the modern world to see, it is neither science nor metaphysics which provides the veil or the fog. Other 'causes' generate practical atheism, and we have no need to seek for 'reasons.' The cares of worldliness and the race for riches are what make the heavens brass and iron. It is they that benumb the will to believe." In *The British Weekly* Dr. James Denney makes an admirably discriminating analysis of Balfour as a theologian and a Christian. He finds in this book a striking affinity to Mr. Illingworth's Bampton Lectures. He thinks Mr. Balfour especially felicitous in his argument for the rational credibility of the doctrine of the incarnation. He is the more grateful for the book because "Mr. Balfour may command a hearing where preachers might knock in vain; and preachers themselves, though they must feel that the power of Christianity to command belief rests in the whole thing taken together, and is lost when an attempt is made to plead for this or that aspect of it in isolation from the rest, will yet find much in it to repay their study and to contribute to their work." One critic says: "What is fresh in the book is, first, its perfectly frank avowal that beliefs do not rest upon reason only or chiefly, and that rationalism is as hopeless a failure in science and politics as in religion; and, secondly, its method of working out this philosophic truth, and its success in showing that the same methods which give us scientific certainty, if consistently pursued, will give us equal certainty in the sphere of religion, and that the realm of mystery in religion is paralleled by the realm of mystery in natural science." One of Balfour's conclusions is that "if the certitudes of science lose themselves in depths of unfathomable mystery it may well be that out of those same depths should emerge the certitudes of religion, and that if the dependence of the 'knowable' upon the 'unknowable' embarrasses us not in the one case no reason can be assigned why it should embarrass us in the other." His method of attack is to doubt the doubts of scientific skepticism and invalidate them; and he does cut the ground from under them, although by reasoning which some insist is capable of being turned against himself, while the broader opinion is expressed that his argument is like a Maxim gun upon the back of a revolving mule—shooting in all directions. This strong and brilliant book on a theme of transcendent dignity and import gives new justification to those who have called Balfour the Tory Gladstone;

and the epithet is likely to be further vindicated when, as is probable, the whirligig of British politics shall make this young leader of the Conservative party prime minister. The envious wish arises in us that American public life could show some men of the intellectual type of Balfour, Salisbury, Gladstone, and Argyll for leadership in the parties and in the nation. *The Bookman*, of London, thinks that *Studies in Theism*, by Professor Bowne, of Boston University, is the only book in recent years which can be profitably compared with Balfour's. This is an ignorant and inane collocation. In no respect is Balfour any mate for Bowne in realms of philosophy and theology, nor does his book belong in the same rank with the writings of the Boston professor. Balfour is only a brilliant amateur who has made a dashing excursion; Bowne is the keenest and most masterful philosophic thinker alive. *The Foundations of Belief* is the stirring sensation of the passing year; *Studies in Theism* is one volume in a systematic statement of philosophic theology which in its completeness will be the unsurpassed possession of centuries.

*The Higher Criticism.* An Outline of Modern Biblical Study. By Rev. C. W. RISHELL, Ph.D. 12mo, pp. 214. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 75 cents.

This book is not just issued, but has been some time before the public, and has received extensive and varied commendation as well suited to the use, and successfully accomplishing the end, for which it was intended. The author is not unknown to the reading public or the general Church. He is a writer of books, booklets, and other contributions to serious and scholarly literature. The readers of this *Review* are profitably and delightfully acquainted with him. After years of cumulative success in the pastorate, crowned last winter by a great revival in Springfield, O., he now goes to the chair of historical theology in Boston University, succeeding Professor H. C. Sheldon, who is transferred to the department of systematic theology. Professor Rishell has also been engaged to write the volume on "Evidences of Christianity" in the Crooks and Hurst Theological Library. As to the importance of the subject of which the book now before us treats none of the readers of the *Review* in Dr. Mendenhall's quadrennium can need to be enlightened. The higher criticism is nothing new. At the oldest it is very ancient; and in its present form, for the most part, our fathers were dealing with it thirty, forty, fifty years ago, perceiving what portion of its suggestions might possibly be true for aught anybody knew, refuting its evident mistakes, and in general resisting its disposition to palm off on us mere hypotheses for proved propositions. Mr. Gladstone, having through a long life included under the powerful scrutiny of his wide-ranging mind the tactics and antics of unevangelical critics, writes recently, "I view with especial satisfaction every effort to abate the pride and rashness of the 'higher criticism,' which, I think, should learn to be more temperate and less dictatorial before it can expect us to welcome its inroads upon the books of the Old Testament." That experienced and

expert biblicist, Professor Henry M. Harman, writes a wise and suggestive Introduction to Dr. Rishell's book; and another eminent scholar and qualified judge, Dr. Milton S. Terry, of Evanston, has this opinion: "I am acquainted with no other work which furnishes in so brief a space a more complete and satisfactory account of the methods and results of higher criticism. It is adapted to acquaint the common reader with the facts, and avoids prolix discussions." From time to time requests have come to this editorial office for information about the higher critics and their work. Almost every one of those inquiries could find in Dr. Rishell's book, in compact and readily intelligible form, the information sought for. Part I presents the aims, methods, principles, and assumptions of the higher critics. Part II deals with the general history of Old Testament criticism, present-day criticism of the Pentateuch, the age of the sources, criticism of the prophetic books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, Jonah, Daniel, Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, Ruth, Esther, Chronicles. Part III treats of New Testament criticism, its general history and present phases, the synoptic question, the gospels, epistles, and other books. Part IV offers an estimate of results, saying that, while criticism is not to be roundly condemned, the traditional view is not to be summarily pronounced unscholarly. Part V asks, "If the critics are right, what?" and makes some judicious and enlightening remarks on the doctrine of inerrancy, inspiration, and the date and authorship of the books of the Bible. A thousand pages of vituperation would not give the reader so clear, correct, and complete an understanding of the higher criticism as Dr. Rishell's calm, comprehensive, scholarly, and well-balanced account. Wherefore he is entitled to the thanks of many.

*Mary of Nazareth and her Family.* A Scripture Study. By S. M. MERRILL, D.D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. 16mo, pp. 192. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 85 cents.

In this volume Bishop Merrill leads an excursion into the debatable ground of Gospel history. His high authority as a guide would in any case give him followers; while the unending fascination which surrounds the person of Mary of Nazareth is an additional reason why many reverent readers will keep him company. Yet he does not write as a cowed ecclesiastic, attaching a superstitious sacredness to the musty legends of the mother Church. Rejecting those traditions which attribute to Mary "qualities unknown to herself and to the times in which she lived" as having their origin "in the midst of the grossest darkness that ever settled on the Church," he claims that the Gospel is the only authoritative record, and searches for the truth in a comparison of scripture with scripture. Discussing first the visit of the magi to the infant Jesus, he reaches a conclusion as to the place of that event which is out of the usual. This visit the bishop holds did not take place at Bethlehem, but at Nazareth, after the return of Joseph and Mary to the latter place, as told by St. Luke. Jesus himself was at least six months old, if not older; and



from Nazareth the holy family took their flight into Egypt to escape the wrath of Herod. We probably venture little in saying that this view is not the ordinary understanding of the Church, but that the consensus of the rank and file of believers establishes the epiphany at Bethlehem, within the first forty days of Christ's life. Yet the putting of Bishop Merrill is strong and engaging. While some of his claims are not beyond controversy, there is a strength in his position which is surprising. Whoever follows the argument carefully will be inclined to recast his views of the whole occurrence. As to the family life of Mary, which the bishop sets out primarily to discuss, he is no less positive and engaging. Our Lord, he claims, had other "brothers" and "sisters" in the flesh, the terms not being used in the accommodated meaning that some have ascribed to them, but in the strictest significance of those words. These sons of Joseph and Mary were James, Josés, Simon, and Judas; the daughters are unknown by name. The discussion of the constitution of the Nazarene family is too full for reproduction here; but the argument sweeps the ground from underneath the feet of the Romish Church in its antiquated claim for the perpetual virginity of Mary, and stamps its persistent Mariolatry as an unwarranted and pagan proceeding. With the outcome of the volume as a whole the reader will find himself in fullest sympathy. The book is not an apotheosis. The limitations of the inquiry are set in the brief records of the evangelists. Protestantism must recognize these limitations and make the best of the silence of the Scriptures. It goes without the saying that in style the book is logical, vigorous, attractive. No better discussion of this great subject has lately been put into such compact form.

*History of Christian Doctrine.* By H. C. SHELDON, Professor in Boston University. 2 vols., 8vo, pp. 898. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$3.50 per set.

In this work the obvious aim is to give an unprejudiced statement of facts. In order to compass this the author endeavors to get as near as possible to original sources—the genuine and trustworthy documents of each successive age. Much use is made, it is true, of secondary sources, but these are not made a substitute for the original, except when the latter are inaccessible. The conciseness of Professor Sheldon's history indicates that he has sought to practice a strict economy of words. He keeps down the bulk of the work as far as is consistent with perfect clearness and a fair degree of fluency in style. The course of events in the different epochs is so mapped out and the subject-matter so arranged as to facilitate clear and easy comprehension on the part of student or reader. The aim of the work is evidently not dogmatic, apologetic, or polemic, but historic. The author's standpoint, which is, of course, that of evangelical Arminianism, is not concealed, but it is not obtrusively paraded in season and out of season. A Lutheran professor reports that he has used the work as a text-book with satisfaction and excellent results. Not to undertake an analysis of the book or a comparison of its various parts, we may remark that the materials of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (the fourth period in the



history) are handled with remarkable thoroughness and success. The scope of and reasons for this revised edition are indicated in the Preface. Considerable additions have been made in the interests of up-to-date accuracy and completeness. An alphabetical index of the main themes is added to the complete analysis of the work contained in the previous editions. Particularly worthy of note are the additions on "Attrition," "Boehme and Baader," and "The Theology of Ritschl." Clearness, simplicity, and fairness, with broad and industrious scholarship, characterize the volumes. They seem equally valuable for private reading and for the recitation room.

*The Greek Tenses in the New Testament.* Their Bearing on its Accurate Interpretation. With a Rendering of the Gospels and Notes. By the Rev. P. THOMSON, B.D., Minister of Dunning. 12mo, pp. 317. Edinburgh: J. Gardner Hitt. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

A very praiseworthy and, in the main, successful attempt to convey to the English reader the fine shades of meaning locked up in the Greek tenses as employed by the gospel writers. The position of the author is that, on the whole and in the main, the writers of the New Testament used correct Greek, observing the distinctions of the classical authorities, and, hence, that these distinctions must be given due weight in our reading. The Revised Version wonderfully improved the rendering of the tenses; but the revisers appear to have overlooked some points, and others they could not adequately treat under the limitations placed upon them by the nature of their task. Mr. Thomson is able to deal with the matter more freely; and his translation is marked by admirable judgment and abundant scholarship. The changes made from the Authorized Version in the tense renderings are marked by a bold, black-faced type, so as to be very easily seized by the eye; and they are so frequent that one gets a great freshening and brightening of the narrative. We fear to begin to quote, lest our space be much exceeded; and, indeed, no single phrases would give an adequate idea of the benefit to be derived from a continuous reading of the evangelists in this most recent of the versions, which puts the ripest results of close study at the command of the unlearned. We can certainly commend the book very heartily, and hope its sale may be such as to warrant the issuing of the rest of the New Testament in the same style.

---

#### PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

*The Evolution of Industry.* By HENRY DYER, C.E., M.A., D.Sc. 12mo, pp. 307. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

This book adds something to the thinking record upon our social questions. The author defines his position in a quotation from an English socialist, that "the issue is between socialism and unsocialism," and that "the socialization of the individual" is the goal of our "evolution" in industry. The tone of the work is ethical rather than economic. Having persuaded himself that society ought to evolve a modified communism,

the author proceeds to show that society is approaching certain communistic methods. He has an Englishman's horror of "carrying it too far," and makes an arbitrary arrest of it when he thinks it ought to stop. He perceives that the individual is to be the beneficiary of socialism, and that the individual is the efficient cause of the wealth which is the bone of contention; and he wants things so arranged that the individual shall be free to do everything except to sin or to starve. All good people share this desire. The socialization of the individual is a good motto; it is merely the Christianization of him. If this process goes on at its present rate for a century or so the better men will surely make a happier industrial world. That they will make it by nationalizing what is now individual is a teaching distinctly prophetic, and probably not inspired. Uninspired prophets about our human future have never been of much value. The ethical spirit of our author is of more service. His "oughts" in the region of education, training, cooperation, and social service are helpful and, sometimes, inspiring. That in all possible ways we shall make a nobler manhood and develop individual capacity and enthusiasm for social service, and that the greatest shall be the servant of all—this is good doctrine, even though it be impaired by yoking it up with a theory of industrial evolution. On what is the main issue in the book a few more words are in place. The author believes that the industrial development of the civilized world has evolved close up to the point where large industries, controlled and managed by large companies, must pass under the control and management of the municipality and the State. The proof that nationalization of land and of industries is the next stage of the "evolution" is incomplete; indeed, it is rather assumed than proved. And there is a broad line between management and control. If the former include State ownership the line becomes broader still. We have, in fact, advanced—if we ever had to advance that way—to control of industry by the State. And as conditions change this control changes form. Let us assume that the authority of the State over corporations becomes thorough and minute. Then, presumably, the chief end of "reform" or "evolution" will be attained. As to State ownership, to many minds it looks like a backward movement rather than a forward one, since less advanced communities have "owned" in common the land, and even the workshops. Given a perfect control of large industries, the problem will be how railroads and mills shall be managed. If the State manages it must do so by agents. How shall it select its agents? It may appoint and pay every person employed, or it may employ companies to manage all details. This last is practically the system by which governments transport the mails and construct public buildings. This method is believed to be more economical and better adapted to the development of the ability and enterprise which produce industrial progress. Our author does not seem to have observed that for a long time now the two methods—by contract and by day's work—have been followed by governments, the two systems moving side by side, and the choice of either depending upon differences in the work or upon accidental or personal influences in

politics. To describe the one as a coming, and the other as a passing, system is to ignore the history of these methods.

*Selected Essays of James Darmesteter.* Translated from the French by HELEN B. JASTROW. Edited, with an introductory memoir, by MORRIS JASTROW, JR., Professor in the University of Pennsylvania. Crown 8vo, pp. 310. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

This is a book to be read eclectically, and by those intelligent enough to discriminate. In its forest are toadstools and mushrooms; some berries sweet and wholesome, others bright and poisonous. It is no place for children. The author, who died in Paris last October, aged forty-five, was a distinguished scholar, a kind of prodigy in learning, a man of frail body and great brain. The son of a poor Jewish bookbinder, he was familiar from boyhood with Jewish lore, with Hebrew and Talmudic literature. He became a master of oriental philology and the foremost specialist in Zoroastrianism, translating into French the *Zend-Avesta*, which, with his comments, made three large quarto volumes. For this triumph of erudition the French Academy bestowed its prize of 20,000 francs, conferred biennially for the most noteworthy achievement of French scholarship. His Persian studies led him to Sanskrit. He was a master of Aryan languages and Semitic tongues; made contributions to Latin philology, published a volume of essays on English literature, edited several English classics, and wrote a volume of poems in which he unfolded his conception of Christ. The essays in this volume are seven in number: "The Religions of the Future," "The Prophets of Israel," "Afghan Life in Afghan Songs," "Race and Tradition," "Ernest Renan," "An Essay on the History of the Jews," and "The Supreme God in the Indo-European Mythology." The best thing in the book is his exaltation of the Hebrew prophets, chiefly in one essay, which fills eighty-eight pages. In another essay he says: "The spirit of the prophets is in the modern soul. . . . They loved everything that we love, and neither reason nor conscience has lost anything through their ideal. . . . Righteousness was to them an active force; the idea was converted into a fact before which all other facts pale. By virtue of believing in justice, they advanced it to the rank of a factor in history. They had a cry of pity for the unhappy, of vengeance for the oppressor, of peace and union for all mankind. They did not say to man, 'This world is worthless.' They said to him, 'This world is good, and thou, too, be good, be just, be pure.' They said to the wealthy, 'Thou shalt not withhold the laborer's hire;' to the judge, 'Thou shalt strike without humiliating;' to the wise man, 'Thou art responsible for the soul of the people.' And they taught many to live and to die for the right, without the hope of elysian fields. They taught the people that without ideals 'the future hangs before them in tatters;' that the ideal alone is the aim of life, and that it consists, not in the glory of the conqueror, nor in riches, nor in power, but in holding up as a torch to the nations the example of better laws and of a higher soul. And, lastly, they spread over the future, above the storms of the present, the rainbow of a vast hope—a radiant vision of a better humanity, more

exempt from evil and death, which shall no longer know war nor unrighteous judges." The essay on "The Prophets of Israel" closes thus: "Nineteen centuries have passed since the noblest spirit of Rome, in the presence of the vileness of the gods and of the priests, uttered a cry of outraged intelligence, 'Nor does piety consist in showing oneself constantly, with veiled face, before a stone, and approaching all the altars, nor in prostrating oneself on the ground and stretching out open hands toward the sanctuaries, nor in sprinkling the altars with the blood of beasts, but in contemplating the universe with a calm mind.' And eight centuries before Lucretius the God of the shepherd Amos exclaims, 'I hate your feast days, your holocausts I despise; from your offerings of fat beasts I turn away my eyes. Away from me with the noise of your songs, that I may not hear the sound of your lyres! But let righteousness gush forth as water, and justice as a never-failing spring.' The religion of the twentieth century is to be found in these two cries; it will arise out of the fusion of prophecy with science." The essay on "The History of the Jews" ends with this sentence: "Humanity, as it is fashioned in the dreams of those who desire to be called freethinkers, may with the lips deny the Bible and its work; but humanity can never deny it in its heart without the sacrifice of the best that it contains—faith in unity and hope for justice, and without a relapse into the mythology and the 'might makes right' of thirty centuries ago." Darmesteter, Renan's greatest pupil, was less Frenchy and frivolous, more serious minded, devout, cleanly, and conscientious than his master.

*Adoption and Amendment of Constitutions in Europe and America.* By CHARLES D. BORGEAUD. Translated by CHARLES D. HAZEN, of Smith College. With an Introduction by JOHN M. VINCENT, of Johns Hopkins University. Crown 8vo, pp. 352. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. Price, cloth, \$2.

This work was awarded the Rossi prize by the law faculty of Paris in 1893. The Swiss author has distinguished himself by other careful and fertile studies in modern democracy, in which he displays both learning and sound judgment. The subject of the present volume is historically treated, and the comparison which so wide a theme permits enables the author to combine the historical and comparative methods to great advantage. In three parts the work discusses (1) "The Origin and Growth of Written Constitutions;" (2) "Royal Charters and Constitutional Compacts;" and (3) "Democratic Constitutions." The first part is properly introductory; the second is a review of an important period of progress toward constitutions, properly so called; the third contains the most interesting and valuable portions of the work. In a history of democratic written constitutions the United States constitutions take the first place. French constitutions follow, and the constitutions of Switzerland take the third and last place. The constitutions of Latin America are considered in an appendix to the book, devoted to our fundamental law. The constitution as a law over lawmaking is an American invention; and the first growths were the Plantation Covenants, the first of which was entered into by the Pilgrims in 1620. The author has

seized upon the importance of the fact that these political covenants were imitated from the Church covenants which united the Pilgrims. The theory of all our constitutions lies in the thesis of a sermon preached by Thomas Hooker in Connecticut in 1638. He affirmed, first, that the people have the right to choose their public magistrates and, also, the right "to set the bounds and limitations" of the power of these magistrates; and he employs language now become familiar, declaring that "the foundation of authority is laid in the free consent of the people." The work of Mr. Borgeaud is a valuable addition to the political literature of the United States. Like Professor Bryce, he naturalizes his work among us by making it a necessary part of our political education. Looking at us through Swiss eyes, he sees much that had escaped American eyes; and his high estimate of our constitutional record is inspiring and will serve the cause of good citizenship among us. It is one of those books which every student of our institutions will have to read if he would be perfect in his reading. But this is not all; to the general reader the book will furnish easy reading upon one of the profoundest themes.

*Songs of the Soil.* By FRANK L. STANTON. 12mo, pp. 217. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Price, cloth, ornamental, \$1.50.

Emerson once wrote: "What we call obscure condition or vulgar society is that condition and society whose poetry is not yet written, but which you shall presently make as enviable and renowned as any." At the present rate it will not be long before no condition or society will remain the poetry of which has not been written. What with Bret Harte, and John Hay, and Joel Chandler Harris, and George W. Cable, and Miss Wilkins, and Ruth McEnery Stuart, and James Whitcomb Riley, and Eugene Field, and S. W. Foss, and various others, the local vernaculars of all parts of our country and the dialects and experiences of all sorts and conditions of men seem likely to get recorded in print. By an increasing class of writers in prose and verse it has been resolved, in the spirit of Robert Burns, that the humblest and homeliest things in the world shall be taken up and written about. They are word painters who, like Millet with his brush, find and depict the meaning and the pathos of common life. Some of them are singers, and all sorts of little everyday things are caught up and knitted on the needles of their versifying, with a result in which our native human instincts have a warm, old-fashioned comfort, as hands and feet have in home-knit woolen stockings and mittens. Up from Georgia now in a volume of verse comes the happy, hopeful, ringing voice of a newspaper man, Frank L. Stanton, a staff writer on *The Atlanta Constitution*, who does but sing because he must, being so full of bubbling boyish life and merry music that no drudgery can repress it. Joel Chandler Harris (Uncle Remus) writes a warm, admiring Preface, in which are these words: "In a period that fairly reeks with the results of a sham culture that is profoundly ignorant of the verities of life, and a sham philosophy that worships mere theories, it is surely something to find a singer breathing unceremoniously into Pan's pipes and waking

again the woodland echoes with snatches of song that ring true to the ear because they come straight from the heart. . . . Here is one with the dew of morning in his hair, who looks on life and the promise thereof and finds the prospect joyous. Whereupon he lifts up his voice and speaks to the heart; and lo, here is Love, with nimble feet and sparkling eyes; and here is Hope, fresh risen as from sleep; and here is Life, made beautiful again." Artless simplicity, homely humor, common sense, touches of tenderness, pure mirth, flashes of fancy, and some imagination rollic and frolic and tumble together in these verses in a way to tickle grown men till they laugh and cry like boys. Of course the critics scowl and say this is not art; but what a dreadful world this would be if there were nothing in it but art! Some one defines eloquence as "making the primitive chords to vibrate." Frank Stanton and Whitcomb Riley, the Georgian and the Hoosier, do undeniably touch those chords; and when you are half ashamed of reading their foolish lines, all at once your inmost heart is stirred, there is a dewfall in your eyes, and a smell of sweetbrier, or honeysuckle, or hay fields, or ripe buckwheat is in the air. An old California miner described a shiftless acquaintance in the patois of the camp, "I've panned him out over and over again, but can't find any color." Stanton's *Songs of the Soil* are sprinkled with some bright grains that give a golden color and value. For a sample of his spirit and style these two verses, taken haphazard, in which he contradicts the saying of William Cullen Bryant that autumn days are "melancholy"—"the saddest of the year:"

These ain't the "melancholy days"—there's lots o' fun in sight;  
The cool and bracing mornin's, an' the big oak fires at night;  
The hounds upon the rabbit's trail, the wild doves on the wing,  
The maiden with the red lips, and the lover with the ring!

These ain't the "melancholy days"—not much! they're full o' life,  
An' you're thankful fer your sweetheart, an' you praise God fer your wife!  
An' then on general principles—in view of what he's givin'—  
You shout a hallelujah fer the privilege o' livin'.

---

#### HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

*The American Commonwealth.* In two volumes. Volume I: The National Government—The State Government. Volume II: The Party System—Public Opinion—Illustrations and Reflections—Social Institutions. Third edition; completely revised throughout, with additional chapters. By JAMES BRYCE, Author of *The Holy Roman Empire*, M. P. for Aberdeen. 8vo. Vol. I, pp. 724; vol. II, pp. 904. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. Price per volume, cloth, \$4.

Some seven years ago an eminent English scholar undertook the great, and it would seem the almost impossible, task of portraying the complex political and social institutions of the United States. In its method of treatment his publication radically differed from that once famous work, De Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*. Avoiding the "temptations of the 55—FIFTH SERIES, VOL. XI.

deductive method," it merely classified the striking features of our national practice and allowed these facts to "speak for themselves;" while De Tocqueville's volume was rather a treatise upon the principle of democracy, "full of fine observation and elevated thinking," and only appealing for its illustrations to American life. The English work, however, like the French, was the result of the author's personal observations in the United States, and these observations were supplemented, as far as his conclusions were defective, by the suggestions of various prominent American authorities whose names are a guarantee for accuracy. With such a genesis, Bryce's work on American institutions has attracted wide notice in the thinking world and has now, within less than a decade, reached its third edition. To review it is to repeat the commendations and the criticisms which have before this been written, since it is virtually a re-issue of the first edition, with statistical revisions and other necessary alterations and enlargements. The first volume is an able study of the nature of our national and State governments, involving an amount of research which the most industrious investigator might dread, and a nice discrimination from whose exercise even one "to the manner born" might shrink. We may only quote the titles of some of the chapters of this volume to show the wide field which Mr. Bryce traverses, among them being the following: "The Origin of the Constitution," "Nature of the Federal Government," "Presidential Powers and Duties," "The Relations of the Two Houses," "The Courts and the Constitution," "Working Relations of the National and the State Governments," "Growth and Development of the Constitution," "Nature of the American State," "The Development of State Constitutions," "State Legislatures," "The Territories," and "Local Government." Prominent among the author's conclusions in this connection is his recognition of the merits of the American federal system. The problem with all federalized nations, he declares, is to "secure an efficient central government and preserve national unity, while allowing free scope for the diversities, and free play to the authorities, of the members of the federation." In the solution of this problem lies the "characteristic merit of the American Constitution." It "has given the national government a direct authority over all citizens, irrespective of the State governments, and has, therefore, been able safely to leave wide powers in the hands of those governments. . . . The application of these two principles, unknown to, or at any rate little used by, any previous federation, has contributed more than anything else to the stability of the American system and to the reverence which its citizens feel for it—a reverence which is the best security for its permanence." The second volume of Mr. Bryce is more miscellaneous. With lynx-eyed scrutiny he looks over the whole range of our political practices, municipal doings, and social workings, and with a skill that is refreshing he disillusionizes the complacent American who dreams that only perfection inheres in his system. All that the author writes, for instance, of "The Machine," "Rings and Bosses," and "Spoils" is true to the life, notwithstanding the recent effective attempts at purgation. With



a master hand he sketches that unctuous and illusive personage, the boss, which every American municipality knows. "An army led by a council seldom conquers; it must have a commander in chief, who settles disputes, decides in emergencies, inspires fear or attachment. The head of the ring is such a commander. He dispenses places, rewards the loyal, punishes the mutinous, concocts schemes, negotiates treaties. He generally avoids publicity, preferring the substance to the pomp of power, and is all the more dangerous because he sits, like a spider, hidden in the midst of his web. He is a boss." The chapter on "The Tammany Ring in New York City" is a stirring portrayal of what has been, but, let it be hoped, is never again to be. Incidentally, the following record of the early Tammany is refreshing: "Already in 1812 it was a force in the city, having become a rallying center for what was then called the Republican, and afterward the Democratic, party; but the element of moral aspiration does not seem to have become extinct, for in 1817 it issued an address deploring the spread of the foreign game of billiards among young men of the upper classes. At one time, too, it possessed a sort of natural history museum, which was ultimately purchased by the well-known showman, P. T. Barnum." As to woman suffrage, Mr. Bryce instances some of the reasons which lead an impartial observer to doubt "whether full political suffrage, as distinguished from school or municipal suffrage, is likely to be granted to women in many of the States of the Union within the next thirty years." Of the bar Mr. Bryce's generalization is the following: "In what may be called habits of legal thought, their way of regarding legal questions, their attitude toward changes in the form or substance of the law, American practitioners, while closely resembling their English brethren, seem on the whole more conservative." Coeducation in the Eastern States is generally held as undesirable, and American colleges and universities are in "a state of transition." Of the domestic exaltation of woman the author pleasantly speaks in a footnote: "I have heard American ladies say, for instance, that an Englishman who has forgotten his keys sends his wife to the top of the house to fetch them; whereas an American would do the like errand for his wife and never suffer her to do it for him." A tribute to American manhood it is, as truthful, let us hope, as it is complimentary! Of American oratory the writer does not speak in words altogether complimentary. In public speaking, he holds, our delivery is "deliberate and even slow." The most common American defect "is a turgid and inflated style. The rhetoric is Rhodian rather than Attic, overloaded with tropes and figures, apt to aim at concealing poverty or triteness in thought by exaggeration of statement, by a profusion of ornament, by appeals to sentiments too lofty for the subject or the occasion. The florid diction of the debating club or the solemn pomp of the funeral oration is frequently invoked when nothing but clearness of exposition or cogency of argument is needed." Finally, the author's chapter on "The Churches and the Clergy" calls for adverse notice, in the facts that the figures of the Roman Catholic membership are incorrectly given, that the ranking of Methodism in educa-

tional matters is hardly complimentary, and that the restriction of a clergyman from speaking on secular subjects *ex cathedra* is not in harmony with the new order. But the larger criticism on the chapter, made in our previous review of Mr. Bryce in 1889, still holds—that altogether too little space is devoted to the work of the Christian Church in America. To compass all its majestic influence on national life in a single chapter of nineteen pages—though the defense might urge that another chapter follows on “The Influence of Religion”—is like the measurement of the great Atlantic in a thimble! But the reader must supplement this cursory notice of a few points in Mr. Bryce’s great work by his own careful study. The treatise deserves the best attention he can give it, since it is the work of a philosopher, and not of a mere compiler. And, however distasteful the experience may be, it is always wholesome to see ourselves as others see us.

*Russian Rambles.* By ISABEL F. HAPGOOD, Author of *The Epic Songs of Russia*. 12mo, pp. 369. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

The ideas now current about Russia are in this book denominated “absurd.” Notwithstanding all that has been written of Russian customs, and that by visitors whose intelligence and judgment we have no reason to question, “the common incidents of everyday life,” if we are to accept the verdict of the present author, “are not known, or are known so imperfectly that any statement of them is a travesty.” Of such an existing necessity for reconstructing present views of Russian life only the specialist is qualified to judge. But, if there be such a need, let us believe that the present author, out of her varied experiences in the land of the czars, is able to lead the reader into the truth. Her volume, at least, has all the clearness of delineation that indicates the trained and accurate observer. “We imported into Russia,” she says, in her opening words, “untaxed, undiscovered by the customhouse officials, a goodly stock of misadvice, misinformation, apprehensions, and prejudices, like most foreigners, albeit we were unusually well informed and confident that we were correctly posted on the grand outlines of Russian life at least.” With these words as a starting point the author proceeds to describe the real Russia in successive chapters, which are in turn humorous, instructive, and charmingly reminiscent. Among the erroneous beliefs concerning Russia is the idea that, as to passports, police, and post office affairs, the official espionage is phenomenally strict. Regarding the censorship exercised over foreign literature, the writer shows that even this supervision has its flexibility. “I once asked,” says she, “a member of the censorship committee on foreign books on what principle of selection he proceeded. He said that disrespect to the emperor and the Greek Church was officially prohibited; that he admitted everything which did not err too grossly in that direction, and, in fact, everything except French novels of the modern realistic school.” The haggling customs of Russian trade are described in vivid coloring, as well as the strange features of Russian summer resorts, the charming home life of Count Tolstoi, interesting peasant

customs, journeying on the Volga, the methods of the Kumys cure, and the quaintness of the Nizhni Novgorod Fair. Of all these matters, however, space forbids a detailed mention. No one, however ignorant of Russia, can read and not receive new light on its national and social life; no one, however indifferent, can fail to feel the spell of the author's enthusiasm.

---

MISCELLANEOUS.

*The Religion of the Republic, and Laws of Religious Corporations. A Treatise on the American Social Structure, Civil and Religious. Being a Concise Statement of the Relations of the States of the Union to the Federal Government Constituting the United States of America, and of the Relations of the Christian Religion to Each and All; Together with the Laws of the Several States concerning Religious Societies, Corporations, Title Deeds, Wills, etc., and Forms in Harmony with the Laws.* By ALPHA J. KYNETT, D.D., LL.D., Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Church Extension of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Assisted by Eminent Legal Counsel. 8vo, pp. 832. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, \$3.50.

Upon three fundamental conclusions Dr. Kynett has built the superstructure of his worthy volume. These conclusions are that Christianity, "not of sects, or of councils, or of human decrees, but of the Bible," is the supreme law of the land; that "all ecclesiastical bodies, churches, and religious societies are, and of right ought to be, subject to the civil authority in all matters involving the legal protection of human rights;" and, lastly, that "the highest duty of American citizenship is to preserve and maintain" the social structure, civil and religious, which has been received from the fathers of the republic. In the maintenance of these all-important propositions Dr. Kynett has written extendedly and well, and has furnished an elaborate introduction to the legal compilations which make up the body proper of his work. So far as the laws of legal corporations themselves are concerned, there are, perhaps, in the Methodist Episcopal Church few authorities superior to himself. His lengthy service as Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Church Extension has brought about his accurate acquaintance with the regulations of the different States of the Union as to religious societies, corporations, title deeds, and kindred subjects, so that this volume is, in a sense, the fruit of thirty years of burden-bearing for Methodism. As to the details of State laws, there is so much included in this compilation that it is reasonably certain no inquirer who seeks for light will be disappointed. The fact that Dr. Kynett has been assisted by "eminent legal counsel" gives an additional value to his book, and the further fact that it is a second edition, in enlarged form, of a former issue speaks well for the possibilities of usefulness for his new volume.

*The Jungle Book.* By RUDYARD KIPLING. 12mo, pp. 303. New York: The Century Company. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

A venture in a new line by a brilliant, powerful, and versatile storyteller. "Mr. Kipling's best bid for immortality;" "a book that speaks of original genius, one that is above the fashion of the hour;" "a book for

youngsters of all ages, from nine to ninety;" "it is as good as the best of Grimm and Hans Andersen;" "nothing about animals since Æsop's fables can compare with it"—such are the verdicts of capable authorities. The book shoots far ahead of the scientists, and tells many things about the denizens of the jungle—the "monkey people," the "snake people," and the rest—that natural history has never reported. The story of "The White Seal" reminds one faintly of Charles Kingsley's *Water Babies*. The author, who is the confidant of all the beasts, obtained part of his jungle knowledge from "the scholarly and accomplished Bahadur Shah, baggage elephant number 174 on the Indian register." These stories appeared in *St. Nicholas* in 1894, and similar contributions from Kipling will be continued during 1895. This volume has reached its fifteenth thousand. Rudyard Kipling knows India, and that this means knowing something of wild beasts and serpents may be judged from the following recent statement: "The number of deaths caused by wild animals is increasing greatly in India, snake bites heading the list last year with 21,000 victims. Of 2,800 persons who were killed by animals, tigers killed nearly a thousand, leopards 291, wolves 175, bears 121, and elephants 68. Ninety thousand head of cattle were destroyed, an increase of 9,000 over the year before. On the other hand, 15,000 wild beasts were killed, including nearly 1,300 tigers and over 4,000 leopards, besides almost 120,000 deadly snakes."

*John March, Southerner.* BY GEORGE W. CABLE. 12mo, pp. 513. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

The author of *Old Creole Days*, *Dr. Sevier*, *The Grandissimes*, and *The Silent South* is easily the chief of Southern writers to-day. His creole stories and prose pastorals of Arcadian Louisiana are rich with true human feeling, exquisite in description, expert in analysis, sunny and tender with humor which is a surface gleam on depths of pathos, and bear the unmistakable tokens of genius. This genius was in time to preempt an unworked vein, a field untilled and unoccupied; has mined that vein to his own enrichment and the world's delight; went into the untouched wilderness of creole life, felled trees, made a large clearing, and built the house of his fame. There he now has a fertile and spacious estate, the result of his own ingenuity, enterprise, and toil. At the start he had the advantage of knowing that rank and tangled Southern wilderness and its possibilities of development. *John March* is a story of the New South, beginning with two Confederate soldiers, plodding homeward at the close of the war, "brooding on the impoverishment of eleven States, and on the hundreds of thousands of men and women sitting in the ashes of their desolated hopes and the lingering fear of unspeakable humiliations." The boy John March is eight years old, astride the horse, with headquarters behind the saddle, his little fists clutching his father's coat, when we first meet him. At the end of his day's ride the tired, comfortable, happy boy no sooner touches the bed than "his spirit circles softly down into the fathomless under-heaven of dreamless sleep." "A child can afford to sleep without

dreaming; he has plenty of dreams without sleeping." One character in the book "wins success by show rather than by merit," carries the day by an audacity little short of fantastical; while of another it is said, "His failures make a finer show than most men's successes; he'd rather shine without succeeding than succeed without shining." It is not always the superior man who succeeds, or the inferior man that fails. A Southern general, being sharply criticised by his neighbors shortly after the war for being too quick to "accept the situation," for harmonizing too much with the federal authorities at New Orleans, and for acting generally as if the war was over, came out in an open letter, in substance to the following effect: "The king never dies; citizenship never ceases; a bereaved citizenship has no right to put on expensive mourning and linger through a dressy widowhood before it marries again. There are men who, when their tree has been cut down even with the ground, will try to sit in the shade of the stump. Such men are those who, now that slavery is gone, still cling to a civil order based on the old plantation system. They are like a wood sawyer robbed of his sawhorse and trying to saw wood in his lap." Whoso desires a glimpse of what went on in the seething South in the *post bellum* years, when society was all a ferment and a foam with the disruption and weltering upheaval of old conditions, social, civil, and economic, and the crystallization of ancient elements into a new and modern state, let him follow the growth and fortunes of John March, Southerner, boy and man, through these five hundred living pages.

*Pushing to the Front; or, Success Under Difficulties.* A Book of Inspiration and Encouragement to all who are Struggling for Self-elevation along the Paths of Knowledge and of Duty. Illustrated with Twenty-four Fine Portraits of Eminent Persons. By ORISON SWETT MARDEN. Crown 8vo, pp. 416. New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

When asked to mention a book teaching the way to success and suitable as a gift to a young man in business we recommended the present volume. Further examination of the work has only increased our first estimate of its worth. In compact form it discusses the qualities of will power, cheerfulness, enthusiasm, tact, accuracy, pluck, persistence, and more that contribute to worldly prosperity. Yet it is far more than a series of abstract essays on well-doing. On the other hand, it is chiefly a grouping, from the lives of great men, of striking incidents which enforce the theoretical lessons taught. Many of the modern leaders of the world, in the various departments of human action, pass in review before the reader and give inspiration to noble endeavor. The portraits of Lincoln, Bismarck, Holmes, Peabody, Morse, Darwin, Webster, and more, over whose lives the passing years have already thrown a glamour, enrich the volume. In its general scope it ranks with the works of Samuel Smiles and Dr. John Todd, while it is more recent and new in its illustration than they. We commend it for its high purpose to help young manhood; for its Christian interpretation of life; for the absence of the homiletic and patronizing spirit; and for a common sense method of treatment that strikes straight to the mark.

*Nobiscum Deus, the Gospel of the Incarnation.* By WILLIAM FREDERIC FABER, Author of *The Church of the Times*. 12mo, pp. 187. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.

Here are a dozen very neat sermons in a very neat dress. There is one each for Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost, together with four on the kingdom of God, and three on other topics. Though evidently by a Churchman, they can be read with pleasure and profit by Christians of all denominations. "The kingdom of God," says the author, "is the enthronement of righteousness and truth and love." All the topics are treated in this broad, beautiful spirit. And, though the reader will not find the poetical diction of a Frederic William Faber or the vigorous originality of a Frederic William Robertson, he will not regret having become familiar with these discourses.

*Literary and Social Essays.* By GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS. Crown 8vo, pp. 293. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, gilt top, \$2.50.

"Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost," is what all men feel like saying concerning the utterances of Curtis, who was one of the most ideal and elegant specimens of American manhood. The subjects of these essays are "Emerson," "Hawthorne," "The Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne," "Rachel," "Thackeray in America," "Longfellow," "Oliver Wendell Holmes," "Washington Irving." In addition, here is that noble and exquisite lecture, written in 1857, and not hitherto published, on "Sir Philip Sidney," which was delivered from many a platform, East and West, through twenty or thirty years, and which seemed to all who were so happy as to hear it the unconscious exposition and definition of the very essence of Curtis's own high-souled, immaculate, chivalric manhood.

*The Book of Numbers.* By the REV. ROBERT A. WATSON, M.A., D.D. Author of *Gospels of Yesterday*, etc. Crown 8vo, pp. 414.

*The Second Book of Kings.* By F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, etc. Crown 8vo, pp. 496.

*The Books of Chronicles.* By W. H. BENNETT, M.A., Professor of Old Testament Languages and Literature, Hackney and New Colleges, etc. Crown 8vo, pp. 464.

*The Psalms.* Volume II. Psalms XXXIX-LXXXIX. By ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D. Crown 8vo, pp. 503.

*The Book of Ezekiel.* By the REV. JOHN SKINNER, M.A., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, Presbyterian College, London. Crown 8vo, pp. 499.

*The Book of Daniel.* By J. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, etc. Crown 8vo, pp. 334.

*The Second Epistle to the Corinthians.* By JAMES DENNEY, B.D. Crown 8vo, pp. 387.

*The Epistle of St. Peter.* By J. RAWSON LUMBY, D.D., Late Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Crown 8vo, pp. 374.

Each of the above eight books in "The Expositor's Bible" series illustrates a high ideal of Scripture interpretation. All that we have said of previous numbers of this series, through the interval of several years, may be repeated in the case of the present volumes. Their textual treatment is general rather than specific; their scholarship is of a superior order, as the names of Farrar, Maclaren, and others show; their vigor, vividness, and practical character make them valuable for the pastor's study. The publishers are A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.

